SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, July 10, 1969.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, July 10, 1969, at 2:15 p.m., at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., President; William M. Brinton, Walter S. Newman, Thomas J. Mellon, and Mrs. Charles B. Porter, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: James S. Kearney, Vice President; and James K. Carr.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation; Dean R. Macris, Assistant Director-Plans and Programs; Phoebe H. Brown, Planner IV; Samuel H. Jung, Planner IV; Peter Svirsky, Planner IV, Zoning; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Scott Blakey represented the San Francisco Chronicle; James Schermerhorn represented the San Francisco Examiner.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Brinton, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of June 12 and 19, 1969, be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, stated that he had attended a joint meeting of the Planning and Development and Streets and Transportation Committees of the Board of Supervisors on Monday and had recommended that the Civic Center Rapid Transit station not have a plaza on the south side of Market Street. The matter had been taken under advisement by the committee.

The Director advised the Commission of matters which had been scheduled for future meetings.

The Director advised the Commission that Miss Gertrude Barnett, property owner on Broadway, had asked to be given a moment to address the Commission concerning the use of the lot adjacent to her property.

Miss Barnett asked if she might be permitted to postpone her comments until closer to election time. After discussion, the Commission agreed to hear from Miss Barnett on August 21, 1969.

Commissioner Brinton stated that he would be out of town on vacation on August 21; and he wondered if he could be advised of the general nature of Miss Barnett's problem. President Fleishhacker believed that Miss Barnett was concerned about billboards which had been constructed on the vacant lot adjacent to her property on the south side of Broadway, east of Van Ness Avenue.

The Director confirmed this to be the case; and he noted that the Commission had discussed the problem previously and had been sympathetic with Miss Barnett's situation; however, it appeared that the Department of City Planning had no legal right to do anything about the problem.

Miss Barnett asked that members of the Commission make an effort to see the property in question before the meeting of August 21.

R69.15 Vacation of a portion of Dwight Street west of Goettingen Street.

Samuel Jung, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"Just north of Woodrow Wilson High School playfield, Dwight Street has a right-of-way width of 60 feet and is currently being improved with a 26-foot roadway in the three blocks between Goettingen and Hamilton Streets. On the south side of the street there is a one-to-one bank sloping down from the school grounds. A long stairway in the bank leads down to Hamilton Street from the exit at the rear of the school property, and a ramp will be constructed leading down in the opposite direction as a part of the street improvement.

"East of the school grounds there are two private residential properties fronting on the south side of Dwight Street at the corner of Goettingen Street whose owners have petitioned for the vacation of the bank area between the new roadway and their property lines.

"The area is in the R-1 zoning district, and new development on the north side of Dwight Street will consist of single-family houses. A 6-foot sidewalk will be installed on the north side of the street as the vacant private property there is developed. The 26-foot roadway should be adequate for a local service street since legislation has been enacted permitting parking only on the north side of the street. Through traffic is carried on Mansell Street two blocks to the south.

"One of the petitioners, owner of Lot 12, Block 6125, wants to acquire the strip in front of his property in order to construct a garage; he would have problems with the driveway if he put the garage on his own property because of the topography.

The owner of the corner property, Lot 1, Block 6125, would acquire enough land for an extra lot. Dwight is an easement street.

"Because of a slide which occurred in front of Lot 1 after grading had begun for the new street, the City will construct and maintain a retaining wall 8 to 10 feet high to hold up the bank for the lot's 80-foot frontage on Dwight Street. The City will also construct a 4-foot wide sidewalk at the bottom of this wall to protect its footing. The intervening land between the wall's south edge and the present property line is proposed for vacation, a strip approximately 22 feet deep and 120 feet long. The City will retain ownership of the wall, which will have expansion joints making it possible to remove a section in order to construct a garage.

"This matter is similar to several other street vacations which the City Planning Commission has considered recently. The proposed sidewalk vacation on Union Street east of Montgomery Street on Telegraph Hill (R64.99) differed from the present case in that it was in a high density area. A proposal for the vacation of a bank on 20th Street in Dolores Heights (R67.56) to facilitate garage construction was recommended against because it would have changed the character of the neighborhood."

The Director recommended that the proposed vacation of a portion of Dwight Street be found in conflict with the Master Plan because it would be contrary to the policy which the City Planning Commission has established in the past few years of recommending against the vacation of street areas to provide off-street parking space. He further recommended that the petitioners apply for revocable encroachment permits if they wished to build garages in the bank area.

Dennis R. Beall, owner of the corner lot, felt that the Director's recommendation had not been based on points which were either pertinent or applicable to the case under consideration; and he indicated that he wished to provide some background information for consideration by the Commission. He stated that the improvement of Dwight Street had been encouraged by speculators and not by individual property owners in the area; and the fact that the improvement project was being undertaken would mean that the individual property owners would experience an economic hardship. His own assessment for the improvement had been in the amount of $2,000. Furthermore, after the cut had been made for the street improvement, a slide had developed which had endangered his property. He had been assured by the City that everything would be all right; nevertheless, the strain and stress of the situation had taken their toll. Under the circumstances, he felt that the least that the City could do would be to let him have at least a "crumb of satisfaction out of the project" by approving the street vacation request.

President Fleishhacker noted that the Director had recommended that the applicants might obtain a revocable encroachment permit if they wished to construct a garage on a portion of the street area. In such a case,the abutting property owners would not actually own the street area; however, they would be able to use it for their own convenience.

The Director stated that his recommendation on the street vacation request might have been different if the school board had been willing to take over the bank along the remainder of the street; however, they had expressed no interest in acquiring the additional property.

Mr. Beall stated that it was the other property owner who wished to use the vacated street area to construct a garage. His own property has access from Goettingen Street; however, the retaining wall which would be constructed would have removable sections so that a garage could be built on Dwight Street at some future date.

President Fleishhacker asked what advantage Mr. Beall would derive from the proposed vacation under those circumstances. The Director replied that Mr. Beall would obtain an extra lot.

Mr. Beall stated that he was not aware that he would acquire sufficient property as a result of the street vacation to create an additional lot. As for his own reasons for wishing to have the street area vacated, he pointed out that the slope is steep and dangerous; and, since he would be liable for any accidents which might happen on the property in any case, he felt that he should be permitted to be the owner of the land.

Commissioner Brinton noted that approval of the street vacation request would increase Mr. Beall's property by thirty percent; and, since Dwight Street is an easement street, the additional property would cost him nothing. Under the circumstances, he felt that the Director's recommendation should be adopted.

Andy Meletis, the owner of lot 12, asked where he would be able to park his automobile if the street vacation request were not approved. The Director repeated his recommendation that a revocable encroachment permit should be obtained for construction of a garage on the street property.

Mr. Meletis remarked that it was his understanding that a revocable encroachment permit could be taken away from him at some future date. Commissioner Brinton acknowledged that fact; however, he felt that it was extremely unlikely that the encroachment permit would be revoked once a garage has been constructed on the property.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the proposed vacation of a portion of Dwight Street west of Goettingen Street is in conflict with the Master Plan because it would be contrary to the policy which the City Planning Commission has established in the past few years of recommending against the vacation of street areas to provide off-street

parking space. It was further recommended that the petitioners apply for revocable encroachment permits if they wished to build garages in the bank area.

R69.28 Acquisition of property for Bayview School site expansion and construction of new school building.

Samuel Jung, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"The present Bayview school was built in 1908 at Flora, Bayview and Pomona Streets and houses 600 children in 20 classrooms, four of which are portable units. The new building will have 30 classrooms for 900 children in kindergarten through sixth grade.

"The twenty R-1 lots occupied by single-family houses proposed for acquisition comprise the remainder of the block, to Thornton Avenue, in which the school is located.

"The total cost of the new school is estimated at $2.4 million, with $1.5 million for construction. Funds will come from the State of California under S.B.28, the McAteer Act (1966) which made grants available for school construction in certain target areas.

"The South Bayshore Plan recognizes the construction of a new school on the site."

The Director stated that a member of the staff had contacted the Hunters Point Bayview Model Cities Agency and had been advised that they were in favor of the proposed project; in addition, one of the ladies directly involved had been contacted and had indicated that she was generally in favor of the project.

Commissioners Porter and Mellon wondered if the proposed acquisition of twenty single-family houses would pose any relocation problems. Commissioner Porter asked if the property owners involved were reconciled to the proposal.

Mr. Vestnys, representing the Board of Education, stated that a meeting had been held with the property owners approximately three weeks ago. At that time, the Director of Property had advised the home owners of the procedures involved and of the City's probable acquisition schedule; and he had indicated that his staff would make every effort to cooperate with the people involved with the objective of relocating them within San Francisco. Commissioner Porter remarked that the State Division of Highways, in acquiring property for freeways, had rarely provided compensation which would allow the people involved to purchase comparable homes; and she wondered if the same situation would apply in the present case. Mr. Vestnys replied that the Real Estate Department of the City and County of San Francisco offers fair and realistic real estate prices for properties which are acquired by the City.

President Fleishhacker asked if moving expenses would be covered by the City. Mr. Vestnys replied that it is not legally possible for the City to pay for moving expenses; however, he thought that it might be possible for the Board of Education, a State agency, to provide some assistance.

Commissioner Brinton asked how many of the twenty single-family homes involved are owner-occupied. Mr. Vestnys replied that he had not made an actual count; however, he believed that most of the homes are owner-occupied.

Commissioner Brinton asked about the condition of the houses which would be acquired. Phoebe H. Brown, Planner IV, replied that the houses are all in good condition.

No one was present to speak in opposition to the proposal.

The Director stated that the basic issue before the Commission was whether use of the subject property for school purposes would be in conformity with the Master Plan. He stated that the South Bayshore Plan, which had already been approved by the Commission, had recommended that the site of the Bayview School should be expanded; and it was apparent that the only direction that the expansion could take place would be southward. Under the circumstances, he recommended that the acquisition of the subject property for expansion of the Bayview Elementary School site, and the construction of a new school building, be approved in conformity with the Master Plan.

Commissioner Brinton agreed that the decision of the Commission should be based on the appropriateness of the land-use proposed; however, he also felt that it was important that the property owners involved should receive fair prices for their houses. He remarked that the Board of Education's fund for acquisition of the property did not seem to be sufficient to allow all of the property owners to purchase comparable homes elsewhere in the City.

Commissioner Mellon, noting that the Real Estate Department is under his jurisdiction, stated that he would make sure that the property owners involved would be fairly compensated for their property.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that acquisition of Lots 2 through 21 in Block 5356 for expansion of the Bayview Elementary School site, and the construction of a new school building, are both in conformity with the Master Plan.

CU69.39 Hunters Point Redevelopment Project area.
Request for planned unit development authorization
(under advisement from meeting of July 3, 1969).

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, noted that the City Planning Commission, during its meeting of July 3, 1969, had adopted a resolution approving reclassification of all R-1-D properties within the Hunters Point Redevelopment Project area to R-2; and he indicated that the staff of the Department of City Planning, during the interim, had prepared a draft resolution of approval for the planned unit development request which contained fourteen conditions. After summarizing the conditions, he recommended adoption of the draft resolution.

The Director stated that the conditions had been reviewed by the Redevelopment Agency and had been found to be acceptable.

Mr. Kellar, representing the Redevelopment Agency, confirmed that the conditions appeared to be satisfactory; and he indicated that he would be willing to rely on the assurances of the staff of the Department of City Planning that the plan which had been adopted for the project area could be developed within the guidelines which would be established by the fourteen conditions contained in the draft resolution.

President Fleishhacker thought that it was important that agreement between the two staffs be reached before the draft resolution be adopted by the Commission since there had been misunderstandings in the past. The Director replied that he was not aware that there had ever been any misunderstandings between the two agencies with regard to planned unit development matters.

President Fleishhacker, noting that the Commission had already approved reclassification of properties within the Hunters Point Project area to R-2, asked if the type of development actually proposed under the planned unit development application would greatly exceed the density which would ordinarily be allowed in an R-2 district. Mr. Steele replied that certain parts of the project would have a density in excess of that ordinarily permitted in R-2 districts; however, the over all density of the project would be approximately that of an R-2 district.

Commissioner Porter wondered if the plans for the Hunters Point Redevelopment Project area would be subject to as many changes as had other redevelopment plans in the past. The Director believed that the plans for the Hunters Point Redevelopment Project area would be firmer than plans in the past since the Redevelopment Agency intended to undertake certain improvements within the project area which would make it essential that the buildings be located as proposed.

President Fleishhacker asked if it were known as a certainty that builders could be found who would be willing and able to conform to the conditions contained in the draft resolution. Mr. Kellar replied that the Agency had engaged

the services of five architects to work on the first phase of the redevelopment project; and those architects had been able to design buildings which would conform with the Master Plan which had been prepared by the Redevelopment Agency and reviewed by the City Planning Commission.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon and seconded by Commissioner Porter that the draft resolution be adopted and that the application be approved.

Commissioner Brinton inquired about the rental range on which the H.H.F.A. had issued their eligibility for the proposed project. Mr. Kellar replied that the rental range for the project would be tailored to meet the needs of moderate and lower-income families; however, in order to achieve that objective, other programs, such as the rent-supplement program, would have to be "plugged in" to plans for the project.

Commissioner Brinton asked if the rental range would be within the formula set forth in Sections 235 and 236 of the 1968 Housing Act which specified a range of between $57 and $155. Mr. Kellar replied that such a range is the one used for public housing; and he indicated that the rental range for the Hunters Point Redevelopment Project area would be based on a formula which would take the income of the individual tenants into consideration.

Commissioner Mellon asked if the Government financing which had been obtained for the first 650 dwelling units in the project area, plus the additional benefits of the rent-subsidy program, would bring the rental cost of those dwelling units within the level of so-called low-cost housing rent. Mr. Kellar replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Newman asked if any renderings of the proposed buildings were available for review by the Commission. Mr. Kellar replied that the renderings had been available during the Commission's meeting on July 3; but he had not brought them to the present meeting. He stated that he would be willing to bring the renderings back to the Commission at some later date. President Fleishhacker stated that the Commission would like to review the renderings.

Commissioner Brinton asked about the proposed construction schedule for the first 600 dwelling units. Mr. Kellar replied that the Redevelopment Agency hoped to begin site improvements on August 15, 1969. Construction of the housing would begin in April, 1970, and would be completed during the Summer of 1971.

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to adopt Resolution No. 6404 and to approve Application CU69.39 subject to the fourteen conditions contained in the draft resolution.

CURRENT MATTERS (Continued)

Mr. Steele advised the Commission that certain properties within the Alamo Square Federally Assisted Code Enforcement Agency are presently zoned CM; and the Director of Public Works had been informed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development that Federal funds cannot be expended upon the CM portion of the Alamo Square Project area until such time as that zoning district is reclassified to a district consistent with the residential character of the remaining project area. He noted that the properties in question face land within the redevelopment project area A-2 which is also zoned CM at the present time; however, under the redevelopment plan adopted for that project, the properties will be developed for medium-density residential use. In fact, the Redevelopment Agency had written a letter to the Department of City Planning requesting reclassification of CM property located within project area A-2 to R-3. Under the circumstances, he recommended adoption of a draft resolution which he had prepared which would declare the Commission's intention of initiating a change in the use district classification of properties fronting on the west side of Webster Street between Fulton Street and Ivy Street from Cm to R-3. The draft resolution would also set the date for a public hearing of that matter for Thursday, August 7, 1969.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Resolution No. 6405.

PRESENTATION OF FIRST ANNUAL REPORT BY MEMBERS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO CITIZENS CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE

James B. Frankel, chairman of the committee, and George A. Williams, staff director, gave an over-all summary of all of the Charter changes which they were recommending and directed specific attention to the changes which would directly affect the City Planning Commission and the Department of City Planning. Having concluded their remarks, they indicated that they would be willing to receive questions from members of the Commission.

Commissioner Porter stated that she had often heard people express the opinion that San Francisco would have fewer problems if it had a strong-Mayor-type of government; yet, it seemed to her that the Charter Revision Committee had gone in the opposite direction, putting great emphasis on a strong legislative-supervisorial type power. She stated that she was particularly concerned about the committee's proposal that the Board of Supervisors should have the power to confirm the appointment of members to the City Planning Commission and that the Board of Supervisors should establish the amount of compensation to be paid to the Commissioners.

Mr. Frankel stated that he found Mrs. Porter's comments to be somewhat refreshing since most people seemed to feel that the Charter Revision Committee had gone overboard in terms of proposing a strong Mayor-form of government.

In fact, the committee had tried to achieve a balance between the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors with adequate safeguards and checks on both. In cases of independent bodies such as the City Planning Commission, the Charter Revision Committee had felt that they should be established in such a way that they would not be too beholden to the Mayor.

Commissioner Porter, noting that Mr. Frankel, during his presentation, had stated that the present Charter makes it difficult for the Board of Supervisors to obtain information under certain circumstances, asked him to clarify his remarks. Mr. Frankel replied that Section 22 of the present Charter prohibits inquiries by the Board of Supervisors into the administration of the various departments; and his committee had recommended modification of that Charter section.

The Director thought that the Charter Revision Committee had done an excellent job, particularly insofar as their recommendations related to the process of Planning and the direction in which that process is heading. He remarked that he had raised some questions regarding the original recommendations of the staff of the Charter Revision Committee; however, most of those questions had been resolved satisfactorily by the Committee when its final recommendations were published. He remarked that many people had repeatedly raised questions regarding the subject of political pressures and influence; however, he did not feel that the proposed Charter would in any way subject the City Planning Commission or its staff to such pressures. In any case, he felt that it is inevitably people and not offices which are independent or not independent.

Commissioner Mellon also complimented the Charter Revision Committee on its work. He indicated, however, that he was concerned about the proposed modification of Charter Section 22. Under the present Charter, the Board of Supervisors has the right of complete inquiry into the affairs of the individual departments; and Charter Section 22 merely prohibits the Board of Supervisors from actually becoming involved in the administration of the various departments. He agreed that there may be a fine line between the right of inquiry and the right to administer; but he felt the basic intent of Charter Section 22 should be preserved.

Mr. Frankel stated that he was in total agreement with Commissioner Mellon; however, an opinion which had been rendered by the City Attorney a number of years ago, had interpreted Charter Section 22 as being excessively restrictive. Under the circumstances, the Charter Revision Committee had tried to devise language which would meet the basic intent of the present Charter in permitting inquiry while prohibiting influence.

Commissioner Brinton remarked that the Board of Supervisors, as previously constituted, acts not only as the City's legislative body but also as a reviewing body for administrative decisions; and he wondered if the proposed Charter would contain some limitations on the Board of Supervisors' right to review administrative decisions. Mr. Williams replied that the present Charter specified that all powers not specifically delegated to other agencies shall be vested in the Board of Supervisors; the proposed Charter, however, would specifically define the powers of both the legislative branches of the government.

Commissioner Newman stated that he had carefully reviewed the aspects of the proposed project Charter language which would affect the Planning function; and he was prepared to give a complete endorsement to those sections of the proposed Charter. After other members of the Commission had had an opportunity to give further study to the proposals, he felt that it would be desirable for them to take a positive position regarding the changes.

After further discussion, the Director stated that he would prepare a memorandum for members of the Commission comparing the functions of the Planning Commission under both the present and the proposed Charters.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio,
Administrative Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, July 17, 1969.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, July 17, 1969, at 2:15 p.m. at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Mortimer Fleishhacker, President; James S. Kearney, Vice President; William M. Brinton, James J. Finn, Thomas J. Mellon, Walter S. Newman, and Mrs. Charles B. Porter, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation; Dean R. Macris, Assistant Director-Plans and Programs; Richard Hedman, Planner V, Urban Design; Peter Svirsky, Planner IV (Zoning); Marie Carlberg, Planner III; James White, Planner III, Urban Design; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Scott Blakey represented the San Francisco Chronicle; Bill O'Brien represented the San Francisco Examiner.

CURRENT MATTERS

Dean R. Macris, Assistant Director-Plans and Programs, recommended the adoption of a draft resolution which he had prepared which would authorize the Director of Planning to execute an agreement with Okamoto/Liskamm, Inc. to undertake urban design studies related to the development of the urban design plan. After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6406.

Mr. Macris advised the Commission that the Chief Administrative Officer, at the request of the Surplus Property Commission, would submit a supplemental appropriation for funds for various city departments to enable them to undertake evaluative work regarding Alcatraz. The supplemental appropriation would include a maximum of $10,000 for the Department of City Planning which would be used to pay consultant help on the project. After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Brinton, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the proceedure described by Mr. Macris be endorsed.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Finn arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the Commission table.

Peter Svirsky, Planner IV (Zoning), submitted a memorandum which he had prepared at the request of the Commission comparing the functions of the Department of City Planning and the City Planning Commission under the present and proposed Charters. After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by

Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously that further consideration of the proposed revisions of the Charter be deferred until the public has had an opportunity to address the Legislative and Personnel Committee of the Board of Supervisors regarding the Charter additions which would affect planning functions. That hearing will be heard on July 24.

R69.37 Pine Street between Hyde and Larkin Streets; change in official sidewalk widths from 12 feet to 10 feet.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, reported on this matter as follows:

"Pine Street is a heavily used one-way westbound street. The Pine Street sidewalks have been narrowed to 10 feet between Jones Street and Gough Street except in the block between Hyde and Larkin Streets. The City Planning Commission has previously approved their narrowing westerly to Presidio Avenue (R64.65) and a contract for that work will be let in August.

Narrowing the sidewalks between Hyde and Larkin Streets will permit uniform striping for three moving lanes and two parking lanes; the parking lane on the south side will be tow away to provide four moving lanes during the evening peak hour."

At the conclusion of his report, Mr. Steele recommended that the Director be authorized to report that the proposed change is in conformity with the Master Plan.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the change in official sidewalk widths from 12 to 10 feet on both sides on Pine Street between Hyde and Larkin Streets is in conformity with the Master Plan.

R69.38 Milton Street between San Jose Avenue and Bosworth Street, change in official sidewalk width on the west side from 13 to 9 feet.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, reported on this matter as follows:

"Milton Street is the street used by traffic coming off the Southern Freeway onto San Jose Avenue to get to Bosworth Street. In the block between San Jose Avenue and Bosworth Street, Milton Street is a one-way southbound with a 24-foot roadway and 13-foot sidewalks. Ray Oil Burner Company is located on the west and

[illegible]

[illegible] Section 82.[illegible] [illegible] Subsection [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

single-family houses on the east. The right turn from San Jose Avenue is tight, a 60° angle, and some accidents have occured. Rathern than prohibit curb parking on the west side of the street, which is used by the company's employees, or along the residential frontage on the east, it is proposed to narrow the westerly sidewalk from 13 to 9 feet.

There are three utility poles on the west sidewalk. Rather than move them back when the street-widening takes place, it would be desirable to underground the utilities at that time."

Concluding his report, Mr. Steele recommended that the change in official sidewalk width be approved providing that the utilities are underground when the sidewalk is narrowed.

Richard Evans, representing the Department of Public Works, urged that the staff of the Department of City Planning reconsider their recommendation that the utility lines on the street should be undergrounded during the course of the street-widening project. If the utility lines were to be undergrounded, property owners on the east side of Milton Street would have to pay between $200 and $500 each for connections to the underground wires. While undergrounding may be aesthetically pleasing, he felt that it might create an economic hardship for the property owners involved.

President Fleishhacker remarked that it was his understanding that property owners are obliged to pay such costs any time that wires are put underground. Mr. Evans confirmed that understanding; however, he stated that the property owners who would be involved in the present instance had neither requested the undergrounding nor been advised that this was being considered.

Commissioner Porter remarked that she did not regard the undergrounding of wires on the subject street to be a matter of great importance.

Commissioner Finn asked how many residences would be affected by the undergrounding project. Mr. Evans replied that 10 or 12 residences would be involved. After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Kearney and seconded by Commissioner Finn that the street widening project be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan without reference to the desirability of undergrounding utilities on the street.

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to authorize the Director to report that the proposed change in official sidewalk width from 13 to 9 feet on the west side of Milton Street between San Jose Avenue and Bosworth Street is in conformity with the Master Plan.

CU69.38 508-530 Powell Street; 472-484 Sutter Street; and northeast corner of Powell and Sutter Streets.
Request for a parking garage for approximately 115 cars in connection with the proposed Knott Hotel which will have approximately 440 rooms; in a C-3-G district.
(Under Advisement from Meeting of July 3, 1969.)

President Fleishhacker noted that the Commission had entertained a lengthy discussion of the subject application during its meeting on July 3; and he recalled that the application had been taken under advisement for two weeks to provide additional time for the owners of the 450 Sutter Medical Building to meet with the applicants to determine if an agreement could be reached which would provide an open space between the two buildings for the protection for the 450 Sutter Medical Building.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, stated that the two parties involved had been in contact during the interim; however, they had apparently been unable to reach an agreement. In any case the only issue before the Commission was whether the proposed parking garage which would exceed 7% of the gross square area of the building would be acceptable. He remarked that the City Planning Code requires that hotels must provide one parking space for every eight rooms; and he noted that that requirement in itself would make it necessary for the parking garage to exceed 7% of the gross square area of the building. However, while that standard of the City Planning Code would require provision of only 50 parking spaces, the applicant had proposed to construct 115 parking spaces; and, as a result, the garage would constitute 16.25% of the gross square area of the building. After describing the traffic flow pattern of the proposed garage, Mr. Steele recommended the adoption of a draft resolution of approval which contained eight conditions.

Joseph Jakubowsky, representing the applicants, confirmed that his clients and the representatives of the 450 Sutter Medical Building had not reached any agreement regarding modification of the plans for the proposed building; however, he hoped that the Commission would be willing to approve the application for the garage as presented.

Mr. Matthews, representing the owners of the 450 Sutter Medical Building; reminded the Commission that he had previously requested that detailed traffic surveys be undertaken by the Department of Public Works before action is taken on the subject application by the Commission. President Fleishhacker replied that the Director of Planning had previously recommended against such a delay because he did not believe that the traffic survey would serve any useful purpose.

Mr. Matthews stated that he was of the opinion that the traffic survey would be important. He confirmed that his clients had met with the applicants to discuss the possibility of modifying the plans for the proposed hotel to locate the hotel tower 14 feet from the common property line. His clients had requested

reputable engineering firms to estimate the additional cost the proposed modification; and a figure of approximately $175,000 had resulted. His clients had agreed to pay half that amount; however, the applicants had indicated that they felt the cost estimate to be unrealistic and they were not willing to accept the figures.

Commissioner Porter felt that everyone, including the applicants, realized the detrimental effect which any building constructed on the subject site would have on the 450 Sutter Medical Building. However, given present circumstances, cost estimates may vary from day to day and from month to month; and she was able to understand why the applicants did not wish to commit themselves to a specific figure. Under the circumstances, it seemed to her that it should be possible for the two parties involved to work out a more flexible agreement whereby each party would be willing to pay one half of the added cost of the proposed plan modification.

Commissioner Mellon doubted that it would be possible to determine the actual cost of the proposed modifications until the project is actually put out to bid; therefore, he moved that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kearney.

Commissioner Newman asked if the conditions contained in the draft resolution were acceptable to the applicants. Mr. Matthews replied in the affirmative.

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to adopt the draft resolution as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6407 and to approve the application subject to the eight conditions recommended by Mr. Steele.

At 2:55 p.m. President Fleishhacker announced that the meeting was recessed Members of the Commission then proceeded to Room 282, City Hall, and reconvened at 3:00 p.m. for hearing of the remainder of the agenda.

3:00 P.M. - Room 282, City Hall

REVIEW OF THE ARMY'S MASTER PLAN FOR THE PRESIDIO

President Fleishhacker stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning would review the Master Plan which had been prepared for the Presidio by the U.S. Army. Following that review, the Commission would receive questions and comments from members of the audience. He emphasized that the Commission has no authority over any projects proposed for the Presidio; however, acting in accordance with the request which had come from the Army, the Commission would try to serve a liaison function between the Army, various local governmental agencies, and the citizens of San Francisco.

Dean R. Macris, Assistant Director-Plans and Programs, read a letter which had been addressed to the Director of Planning from Colonel Robert E. McMahon, Commanding Officer of the Presidio, as follows:

"We are most happy to respond to your request for planning information on the Presidio of San Francisco which you can present to interested citizens. Events of the last several months show that there are evidently significant matters on which the citizens have not kept themselves informed, even though most have been published at one time or another. I hope that this information will help you fill the gaps.

It is necessary to understand several major considerations which affect construction at the Presidio, in common with any US Army post in the United States. You are familiar with them, but I will repeat only to make certain that the citizens are aware of them.

a. The sole purpose of any Army post is to perform the Army mission as prescribed by higher headquarters.

b. Construction projects are thoroughly planned to satisfy overriding Army requirements and must receive approval at successive levels including the United States Congress. Competition for construction money is keen and only the most worthwhile projects survive.

c. Engineering and architecture of Army construction is done by professionals considering in order of priority: mission requirements, morale and welfare of military personnel, economy of siting and construction, and other factors.

The geographic location and history of the Presidio make its land valuable for purposes other than military. Accordingly, the Army has made available lands necessary for public purposes, such as access to the Golden Gate Bridge, the Public Health Service Hospital, and others. These are shown on a separate map in a red tint. Likewise, the Army itself has missions and requirements which are centralized in Washington, but physically located at the Presidio. Examples are the Letterman General Hospital and the Army Institute of Medical Research. These are shown in a yellow tint. As you can see by examining this map, the agencies represented by tinted areas reduce the amount of Presidio space available for Sixth Army purposes, frequently use the best land available, and severely constrain our planning.

The information covers all known planned facilities. Please note that our planned construction is generally confined to the interior of the post, usually to replace worn out buildings. Our engineers will avoid areas requiring tree removal insofar as possible and otherwise will remove only those necessary.

In view of Mr. Fleishhacker's remarks on 2 July, we look upon the Planning Commission as our point of contact with the City for planning matters. Therefore, we will refer all requests for such information to you. If you, or members of the Planning Commission, have questions, please ask us, preferably in writing."

Mr. Macris also advised the Commission that the Presidio consists of approximately 1400 acres of land of which 450 acres are not under the direct control of the Presidio command.

James White, Planner III, Urban Design, described a generalized land use map of the Presidio, pointing out the specific areas which are under the control of the Presidio command and those areas which are presently under the command of other jurisdictions. Subsequently, he described the Presidio's Master Plan for future development pointing out the location of existing housing, housing presently under construction, and areas which will be reserved for future housing sites. He also described the new construction projects which were being proposed by the Presidio as well as by other jurisdictions which control property within the boundaries of the Presidio. In conclusion, Mr. White called attention to a map which had been prepared to show the location of buildings which will be demolished by the Army.

Commissioner Newman asked if any schedule had been released by the Army indicating the sequence in which the new housing sites would be developed. Mr. White replied that such a schedule had not been made available since no funds had been allocated for housing which is not already under construction. He stated that 924 housing units for families presently exist in the Presidio; and 252 units are now under construction.

Robert Lilienthal, representing the Pacific Heights Association of Neighbor advised the Commission that his Association had approximately 600 members. He asked if property located north of the Julius Kahn program had been designated as a housing site. Mr. Macris replied in the negative indicating that the property in question was being reserved for use as a parking lot for an adjacent playing field.

Mr. Lilienthal then asked about property located east of the proposed El Polin school site which he had previously believed to be under lease to the Recreation and Park Department. Mr. Macris replied that the property had been offered to the Recreation and Park Department but had not been accepted.

Mr. Lilienthal then remarked that the map which had been described by Mr. White indicated that a much larger site was being reserved for the El Polin School than that which was included in the lease arrangement between the Army and the Board of Education. Mr. Macris replied that the Army, in response to a previous recommendation of the City Planning Commission, had expressed its willingness to expand the school site northward.

Mr. Lilienthal questioned the firmness of the Army's commitment to the original school site based on their agreement to modify the site at the present time. President Fleishhacker remarked that such an assumption did not follow logically from the facts.

Mr. Lilienthal asked if the Army had provided figures which would indicate how many housing units might be built on the east side of the Presidio as opposed to the west side of the Presidio in the future; and he indicated that such figures might

affect the decision as to which of the two schools proposed will be built first. Mr. White replied that the Army had provided no figures whatsoever for housing which is not presently under construction; and, in any case, the figures which had been made available were related to the Presidio as a whole and not to particular subdivisions or areas.

Michael Fischer, Associate Director of the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association, stated that his organization was primarily concerned with the Presidio as an open-space resource. In his opinion, one of the most important factors to be considered is the appearance of the Presidio as open space as viewed from a distance; and, in that regard, he felt that it would be desirable to have an urban design plan for the Presidio based on a map which would indicate the topographical features of the entire site.

Mr. White stated that he had purposely used the word "open" instead of the words "open space" on his maps of the Presidio to emphasize that no commitment had been made by the Army for the preservation of "open space" as such.

Mr. Fischer stated that he also wished to take issue with the statement contained in Colonel McMahon's letter that "the sole purpose of any Army post is to perform the Army mission." Aside from a military function, he felt that the Presidio serves other important functions in San Francisco. The Presidio is publicly owned; and it constitutes a valuable open-space resource within the city. Under the circumstances, he felt that any plan for the development of the Presidio should reflect the Presidio's responsibility for maintaining open space. He recommended that the Commission adopt a resolution which would establish a continuous collaborative planning process with the Presidio; and, as a matter of first priority, he urged that the Commission work with the Army corps of engineers to try to impress upon them the importance of viewing the Presidio as a scenic resource instead of viewing it solely as the headquarters of a military mission.

Robert Froin, a property owner, remarked that the 100,000 square foot armory to be constructed by the Army in the southwest corner of the Presidio would actually be quite a large structure; and he questioned the accuracy of the scale of the building as indicated on the map that had been described by Mr. White. He understood that any information which had been made available by the Army had been provided as a courtesy; and it seemed to him that the relationship between the Army and the City Planning Commission was quite good. However, he wondered if the Army was merely trying to satisfy the public while proceeding to do exactly what it wanted. President Fleishhacker assured Mr. Froin that the Army did wish to cooperate with the public.

John Binggs, President of the Presidio Society, advised the Commission that the mission of his society is to maintain the Presidio in its present status quo allowing, of course, for reasonable changes which must be made; and he informed the Commission that his society had endorsed the El Polin School site. With regard to the question raised by Mr. Fischer regarding the statement contained in Colonel McMahon's letter to the effect that the sole purpose of any Army post is to perform

the Army mission, Mr. Binggs pointed out that while that might be the case, the command of the Presidio had always considered the Presidio to be the second Golden Gate Park of San Francisco; and, in that light, they had made an effort to preserve the scenic beauty of the Presidio and to make available portions of the Presidio for public activities. In conclusion, he stated that many of the people who were of the opinion that the Presidio had not cooperated with the public have probably not opened their mail for the past three years.

President Fleishhacker asked Mr. Binggs to indicate the number of members in his society and to comment upon whether their homes are in San Francisco. Mr. Binggs replied that the society's membership, as of the previous day, consisted of 303 families most of whom lived in San Francisco; some of the families, however, live in Marin County.

William T. Holden, Chairman of the Board of the Presidio Society, stated that the society is devoted to the preservation of the Presidio and to the comfort of the people living on the Post. While the Commission was ostensibly discussing plans for the entire Presidio, he felt that the principle issue before them at the present time related to the sites of the two schools which will be constructed in the Presidio. He had presonally inspected both of those sites, and he was puzzled by the fact that anyone could oppose construction of a school on the El Polin site. He felt that the El Polin site would provide a lovely wooded environment for an educational facility; and, since the property would be made available to the city at no cost, he could not understand why some people objected to the proposal. As a matter of fact, he believed that the only people who opposed the school were a few residents who live opposite the subject site.

President Fleishhacker remarked that the City Planning Commission had no authority to approve or disapprove either of the proposed school sites.

Commissioner Brinton questioned the accuracy of President Fleishhacker's statement and suggested that an opinion should be requested from the City Attorney regarding the right of the Board of Education to enter leases without first receiving from the City Planning Commission a report as to whether such leases would be in conformity with the Master Plan.

Richard Hamm, President of the San Francisco chapter of the Friends of the U.S. Army, stated that he had a copy of the lease which had been negotiated between the Army and the Board of Education; and, regardless of whether the Board of Education should have come before the City Planning Commission or not, the lease was a valid legal document under which the Board of Education would be required to construct schools on both the El Polin and the Lobos Creek sites. In conclusion, he stated that the appropriate officials at the Presidio had verbally expressed their willingness to expand the El Polin site by leasing five additional acres to the Board of Education.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Kearney absented himself from the meeting room for the remainder of the meeting.

Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning, emphasized that any recommendation which might have been made by the City Planning Commission regarding the conformity of the leases to the Master Plan would have been advisory and not mandatory in nature.

Mr. Macris pointed out that the Board of Education had asked the City Planning Commission to comment upon the appropriateness of the two school sites; and, though the leases had already been negotiated at that point, the schools had not yet been built.

Mr. Vestnys, representing the Board of Education, confirmed that the Board of Education had requested the City Planning Commission to review and report upon the appropriateness of the two school sites which had been recommended by the Army; in addition, the Commission had been asked to comment upon any other site within the Presidio which it felt might be appropriate for school purposes. No final decision had yet been made regarding the location of the two schools to be constructed in the Presidio; and, while the Board of Education is a state department and not subject to local rules and regulations, they would be willing to work with the Department of City Planning, the public, and the Army to select sites which would be mutually acceptable.

Commissioner Porter asked if Mr. Vestnys meant to imply that the Board of Education was not committed to the El Polin site or to a peripheral site for the school. Mr. Vestnys replied that the school would have to be located on a peripheral site in order to be eligible for funds from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Commissioner Newman, noting that the Army had indicated their willingness to expand the El Polin school site from 10 acres to 15 acres, asked if the additional property would be used to expand the size of the proposed school. Mr. Vestnys replied in the negative, indicating that the additional land would only allow the school to be located further northward from the Presidio boundary.

President Fleishhacker inquired about the Department of City Planning's present status regarding the proposed school sites. Mr. Macris replied that the City Planning Commission, durings its meeting of May 29, 1969, had found the Lobos Creek site to be acceptable and the El Polin site to be acceptable only if it were to be expanded and the school were to be constructed in accordance with design specifications which had been recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning. Then on July 3, the Commission had rescinded its previous action and had requested that a committee of the Commission meet to review other potential sites for the schools. That committee had met and was prepared to make a report to the full Commission.

Mr. Lilienthal stated that people who live adjacent to the Presidio do care deeply about what happens in their neighborhood. He indicated that he had been the first president of the Presidio Society; and, as recently as 1963, one of the local newspapers had quoted him as proposing that the entire Presidio should be zoned for open use; and then, as now, the apparent purpose of the Presidio Society was to preserve the Presidio in its status quo. He remarked that Congressman Mailliar

had recently taken a poll of his constituents to determine what use should be made of government surplus land; and, while the Presidio had not yet been declared surplus, he felt that the results of the poll showing that 56% of the people interviewed were of the opinion that surplus government land should be used for open space and recreation and that only 18% of those interviewed felt that surplus land should be used for schools and hospitals were significant to the question before the Commission. In addition, Mr. Lilienthal noted that an Urban Design report which had recently been published by the staff of the Department of City Planning had remarked on the importance of the Presidio and Golden Gate Park as visual elements contributing to the feeling of open space in the city.

Mr. Lilienthal stated that the members of his organization did not oppose the construction of a school in the Presidio; however, they believed that better sites are available than the sites which had been designated by the Army. He remarked that the El Polin site contains a large number of trees; and, at present, the area is used for walking, camping, and other activities. The area also contains a panoramic view site known as Inspiration Point. He recognized that the Army is not subject to the jurisdiction of the Department of City Planning; however, he believed that the Army would be prepared to give high priority to the wishes of the community. In that light, his Association had addressed a letter to the City Planning Commission requesting that the staff of the Department of City Planning study all potential school sites within the Presidio and that the study not be limited to the perimeter areas of the Post. He stated that he had discussed the matter with representatives of the Army who appeared to have taken the position that the schools will be built on the sites which had already been designated; and, in fact, General Larson had stated that he would ignore anything that the Commission had to say on the matter. In his opinion, the Army should not place itself above the people in a democracy; and he felt that it should be responsive to the persuasion of the City Planning Commission and other such groups. He stated that the Presidio as a whole had been designated as an historic landmark; and, under the circumstances, he wondered if the Department of the Interior would have the authority to review new projects proposed for the Presidio. He felt that the Commission should follow Commissioner Brinton's suggestion and request an opinion from the City Attorney regarding the Commission's authority to determine whether the proposed sites would be in conformity with the Master Plan. Since the perimeters of the Presidio contain a great deal of forested land and useful space, he felt that the schools and any new housing to be built on the Post should be concentrated in the interior areas; and he urged the Commission to adopt a declaration of policy in support of preserving the natural areas along the borders of the Presidio in their present state.

Commissioner Porter remarked that the City Planning Commission had been brought into the issue only recently in spite of the fact that the lease between the Board of Education and the Army had been signed in 1967; and the Commission had been advised that a $550,000 grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare might be unavailable if a decision is not reached regarding the school sites by August 1. The Commission had been informed by the Board of Education that only peripheral sites would be acceptable; and, therefore, while the Commission had reviewed other possible sites for the school, the sites considered had been limited

[illegible]

to the periphery of the Presidio. After their review of the alternate sites, the committee of the Commission had decided that the El Polin site would be the least objectionable of all those which had been reviewed.

Mr. Lilienthal suggested that the Board of Education might request an extension of time from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. In any case, the Board of Education had seemed to be most cooperative; and he believed that they would be receptive to any suggestions which the City Planning Commission might offer.

Mr. Browning, Post Sergeant for the Presidio, stated that it is his job to advise the Commander on matters which relate to military personnel, including schools. His objective was to have the first of the two new schools located where it would serve the maximum number of housing quarters; and he advised the Commission that only 500 of the 1,200 children between the ages of kindergarten and the sixth grade are housed on the west side of the Presidio. Under the circumstances, he felt the first school should be constructed on the El Polin site. If the school were constructed in accordance with the guidelines recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning, it would consist of a cluster of small buildings which would not necessitate the removal of many trees.

Mr. Browning stated that the Unified School District already bears responsibility for the education of children living on the Presidio; and, if a new school were constructed, overcrowding of existing classroom space would be reduced and the necessity for bussing would be eliminated. The new school would, in fact, reduce the classroom shortage of the Unified School District from 80 rooms to 60 rooms. He noted, however, that once the new school is constructed, the Unified School District will have complete control over its usage; and, if the Board of Education so desires, the school could be used for children from Hunters Point. Therefore, the city would obtain a new school without having to bear the tax burden of a bond issue. With regard to the siting of the school on the perimeter of the Presidio, Mr. Browning remarked that the Board of Education would be responsible for providing light, power, water, and other utilities to the school; and, as a result, a good deal of money could be saved if the schools were to be located on the periphery of the Presidio where such services are already available. If the site is now used for camping, he emphasized that such a use had been authorized only because of the good will of the Presidio; and, while some individuals have complained about the removal of trees from the Presidio, he advised the Commission that new trees have been planted for every single tree which has been removed. In conclusion, Mr. Browning stated that he disagreed with Mr. Lilienthal's paraphrasing of General Larson's comments. He believed that General Larson had stated that he would not be willing to commit himself to any site which the Planning Commission might recommend for the schools; however, he had expressed a willingness to consider areas other than the El Polin site.

Colonel Baum, Post Engineer for the Presidio, confirmed that General Larson had not stated that he would ignore anything that the Commission might say regarding the school site issue.

Mr. Lilienthal stated that General Larson had indicated that he did not object to having the staff of the Department of City Planning undertake a study of alternate sites; however, he intended to have the school built wherever he wished.

President Fleishhacker believed that General Larson had meant to indicate that he would have to reach a decision regarding the school site based on his prerogative as an officer of the U.S. Army and that his decision could not be overruled by the City Planning Commission. In any case, such comments would have little to do with the advisory recommendation which would be made by the City Planning Commission.

A member of the audience asked if the schools which would be constructed in the Presidio would be adaptable to the new educational system which will be initiated in September, 1970. Mr. Macris replied that location of the schools on the periphery of the Presidio would be essential to the workings of that program.

Mr. Hamm remarked that the Presidio had never been a part of the City and County of San Francisco; yet, he felt that the Presidio had contributed a great deal to the city. Under the circumstances, he did not understand why some people were objecting to the school sites which had been proposed. He stated that the sites had been discussed with the Board of Education as early as 1966; and the leases had actually been negotiated retroactive to August 1, 1967. Yet, the schools had not been built. Both sites had been reviewed by the Department of City Planning; and the El Polin site had been modified to meet the criteria which had been recommended by the Commission. The leases provided that permanent schools must be constructed on the sites by 1972; and, if no decision were made before August, 1968, money for the schools might not be available from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. He felt that the first school should be constructed on the El Polin site; and he feared that if that site were not approved by the Commission, the funds from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare would be lost.

At 5:00 p.m. President Fleishhacker announced a 10-minute recess. The Commission reconvened at 5:10 p.m. and proceeded with its consideration of the Presidio.

Commissioner Porter, Chairman of the committee which had studied the school site issue, asked Mr. Macris to describe the alternate sites which had been considered by the committee. Mr. Macris reported on the alternate sites as follows:

"1. The area on the eastern side of the new Letterman General Hospital. This parcel of approximately five acres was found to be unsuitable for the location of an elementary school because of the proximity of intensive institutional uses which generate heavy traffic and create serious parking problems. It is also the site for the Western Medical Research Institute which, according to the Army, will be built under the auspices of the Surgeon General's Office in the very near future.

Mr. Williamson stated that General Lawson had indicated that he did not object to having the staff of the Department of City Planning undertake a study of alternate sites; however, he intended to have the school built whatever [illegible].

President Fleishhacker observed that General Lawson had seemed to indicate that he would have to reach a decision regarding the school site based on his own interests as an officer of the U.S. Army and that his decision could not be overruled by the City Planning Commission. In any case, such comments could have little to do with the advisory recommendation which would be made by the City Planning Commission.

A member of the audience asked if the schools which would be constructed in the Presidio could be adaptable to the new educational system which will be initiated in September, 1970. Mr. Harris replied that location of the schools on the periphery of the Presidio would be essential to the workings of that program.

Mr. Blair remarked that the Presidio had never been a part of the City and County of San Francisco; yet, he felt that the Presidio had contributed a great deal to the city. Under the circumstances, he did not understand why some people were objecting to the school sites which had been proposed. He stated that the sites had been discussed with the Board of Education as early as 1965, and the leases had actually been negotiated with that Board in August, 1967. Yet, the schools had not been built. Both sites had been reviewed by the Department of City Planning; and the El Polin site had been modified to meet the criteria which had been recommended by the Commission. The leases provided that permanent schools must be constructed on the sites by 1971; and, if no decision were made before August, 1968, money for the schools might not be available from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. He felt that the first school should be constructed on the El Polin site; and he feared that if that site were not approved by the Commission, the funds from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare would be lost.

At 5:00 p.m. President Fleishhacker announced a 10-minute recess. The Commission reconvened at 5:10 p.m. and proceeded with its consideration of the Presidio.

Commissioner Porter, Chairman of the committee which had studied the school site issue, asked Mr. [illegible] to describe the alternate sites which had been considered by the committee. Mr. [illegible] reported on the alternate sites as follows:

1. The site on the eastern side of the new Letterman General Hospital. This parcel of approximately five acres was found to be unsuitable for the location of an elementary school because of the proximity of intensive institutional uses which generate heavy traffic and create serious parking problems. It is also the site for the [illegible] Medical Research Institute which, according to the Army, will be built under the auspices of the Surgeon General's Office in the very near future

2. The western side of Lyon Street between Greenwich and Filbert. Upon investigation, this three-acre site was found to be quite restricted by surrounding buildings and would not allow enough space to provide an adequate school yard and playground. According to the Army, this site is to be used for the construction of a Military Police Headquarters to be built in 1970.

3. North of the Julius Kahn Playground in the area presently used as a parking lot for the Special Services baseball field. This site is the most suitable of the five alternate locations which have been examined. However, it has three distinct disadvantages.

   a. It is less accessible than the other sites examined.

   b. The buildable area is less than two acres and therefore does not compare favorably to other site possibilities examined by the staff.

   c. Because the site is on unengineered fill, cost of construction would be substantially greater. It is our understanding that the Corps of Engineers has made soil boring tests in this area. We are advised that as result of the Corps tests, an engineering judgment was made that construction on the site would require extensive piling foundations. The staff requested a copy of the Corps of Engineers report on this matter and were advised that one could not be made available. In pursuing the matter further, the staff was told that the site is not available.

4. Approximately four acres along the western edge of Julius Kahn Playground. Since this are contains a major grove of trees and since construction of a school would require their removal, the site was not considered further by the staff.

5. West of the Presidio Boulevard entrance in the southeast corner of the Presidio. This general area contains ten to twenty acres of eucalyptus trees and open space. Again, construction of a school in this location would necessitate substantial removal of trees and would destroy the natural beauty of the area."

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Subsequently, Mr. Macris asked Mr. White to review the school enrollment figures which had been made available by the Presidio and which had been approved by the Board of Education. Mr. White stated that there are presently 395 children between the ages of kindergarten and 6th grade living on the east side of the Presidio and 354 children living in housing on the west side of the Presidio. In future stages of construction, 160 children would be added to the eastern half of the Presidio and 120 children would be added to the western half of the Presidio. Another 56 children who would be housed in the northern part of the Presidio could be allocated to either the eastern or the western side of the Post. The Army had allocated those children to the eastern side of the Post to project a total enrollment of 611 children for the El Polin School in 1970 as opposed to 474 pupils for the western school.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Finn absented himself from the meeting room for the remainder of the meeting.

Mr. Macris stated that it was the recommendation of the staff of the Department of City Planning that the Lobos Creek School be built first in view of the expressed concern of the members of the community and the apparent balance in enrollment which could be achieved for the two schools. Of the alternate sites which had been reviewed for the school to be located on the eastern side of the Post, the El Polin site, with the modification and design guidelines previously recommended by the Commission, would seem to be the most acceptable site.

Commissioner Mellon pointed out that the enrollment of the Lobos Creek School would still be less than the enrollment of the El Polin School even if the 56 children in question were allocated to the western side of the Post; and, under the circumstances, he could not understand why the staff was recommending that the Lobos Creek School be built first.

Mr. Macris replied that the staff's recommendation had been based on a balance of enrollment and on the concerns which had been expressed by Mr. Lilienthal.

President Fleishhacker stated that the committee of the Commission had supported the staff's recommendation because of the obvious community relations problem which was associated with the El Polin site. He acknowledged that construction of the first school on the Lobos Creek site would do no more than postpone the problem with the El Polin site; and, since the issue has not one of a planning nature, a final decision on the matter would have to be reached by the Board of Education and the Army, all other things being equal.

Commissioner Mellon remarked that some very meaningful arguments had been presented in favor of the El Polin site.

A member of the audience asked if the funds which were available for construction of a new school could be used for the El Polin site. Mr. Vestnys replied that the $500 grant which would be obtained from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare would be earmarked for the construction of "classrooms" in the Presidio. No particular site had been stipulated.

Commissioner Mellon asked if the Board of Education had indicated any preference for one of the two sites. Mr. Vestnys replied that no such action had yet been taken by the Board of Education.

Commissioner Mellon then suggested that the Commission should endorse both sites and leave the question of priorities up to the Board of Education.

Commissioner Newman remarked that the opponents of the El Polin site had previously indicated that they would be willing to accept that site if other sites were first investigated; and he noted that other sites had been investigated and had been found to be unsatisfactory.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that both the Lobos Creek school site and the El Polin School site be endorsed providing that the El Polin site is expanded as proposed by the Army and providing that the design guidelines previously recommended by the Commission for the site are met.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Administrative Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

where's July 24?

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, July 31, 1969.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, July 31, 1969 at 2:15 p.m. at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Mortimer Fleishhacker, President; James S. Kearney, Vice President; Thomas J. Mellon, Walter S. Newman, and Mrs. Charles B. Porter, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: William M. Brinton and James K. Carr.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation; Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator; Samuel Jung, Planner IV; Phoebe H. Brown, Planner IV; Peter Groat, Planner IV; Marie Carlberg, Planner III; James Paul, Planner III, Housing Specialist; Judith Lynch, Planner II and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meetings of June 26 and July 10 an 24, 1969, be approved as submitted and that the minutes of the meetings of July 3 and 17, 1969, be approved with corrections.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Kearney arrived and assumed his seat at the Commission table.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported on Wednesday's meeting of the Urban Design Citizens Advisory Committee and distributed copies of a statement of objectives for the Urban Design Study.

The Director informed the Commission that the Board of Supervisors, at its meeting next Monday, will consider the feasibility and desirability of establishing a joint powers agreement under which proposals could be developed for extending the BART System to the Airport.

Acting on the recommendation of the Director, the Commission scheduled a special meeting for September 11, 1969, at 8:00 p.m. for presentation of the South Bayshore Plan in the community, possibly at the South San Francisco Opera

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

House. The Commission invited the Bayview Hunters Point Model Cities Agency to meet jointly with them on that occasion.

The Director recommended adoption of a draft resolution which would authorize him to execute an agreement with a professional planning consultant firm to assist the staff of the Department of City Planning in preparing land use and design criteria for Alcatraz. He stated that he was not positive that the contract would actually be negotiated; however, in view of the deadline set by the Surplus Property Commission, quick action would have to be taken if a decision were to be made that consultant help would be needed. Therefore, he requested that the draft resolution be adopted.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6408.

President Fleishhacker suggested that a special meeting should be held early in September to discuss the issue of Alcatraz in greater detail.

R69.39 Vacation of a portion of Tehama Street between Fourth and Fifth Streets.
Samuel Jung, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"The Redevelopment Agency has requested the vacation of a portion of Tehama Street beginning 100 feet west of 4th Street and extending westerly for 175 feet. The purpose of the proposed vacation is to enlarge the site of a housing project for the elderly to be located between Tehama and Clementina Streets. The street area to be vacated will connect the site with a 75-foot wide 155-foot long "panhandle" extending to Howard Street.

The redevelopment plan for the Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Project Area D-1 shows Tehama Street as being vacated from 4th Street to a point 275 feet westerly. However, the most easterly 100 feet of Tehama Street is omitted from the vacation request at this time to provide continued access for the Salvation Army at the southwest corner of 4th and Tehama Streets, and for the gas station on the northeast corner, the latter a location which the City Planning Commission had requested the Redevelopment Agency to investigate for use for housing or for a combined housing and commercial development (Resolution No. 6333, January 23, 1969.)

In addition to approving the redevelopment plan in January, 1966, the City Planning Commission, in authorizing a conditional use (CU 69.5, January 23, 1969) for public housing for the elderly in a C-3-S zoning district, made as a condition of the authorization that procedures to allow the landscaping and closing to vehicular traffic of the subject portion of Tehama Street should be commenced in sufficient time to allow development of the street prior to occupancy of the housing.

The most important question at issue is that of satisfactory access for property owners outside of the project area served by the remaining portion of Tehama Street. In the block between 4th and 5th Streets, Tehama Street is 40 feet wide, including 10-foot sidewalks, and is one-way westbound; its companion to the south, Clementina Street, is 35 feet wide including 7-foot sidewalks, and is one-way eastbound. There is heavy truck traffic on these two streets because of the industrial uses to the west.

The redevelopment plan provides for a new 50-foot wide connector street between the two, for which the Redevelopment Agency has acquired the land. It will have narrow sidewalks and the turning radius will be adequate for trucks and firetrucks. The Department of P blic Works, Division of Traffic Engineering, would like to prohibit access directly to the connector from abutting properties to the west. Timing of construction of the connector street has not yet been determined. Since it is on the boundary of the redevelopment project area, the Agency has funds for only one-half of the construction and the other half will have to be included in next year's City budget or be the subject of a supplemental appropriation, or else the Agency will have to request approval for a ruling from the Department of Housing and Urban Development that the entire cost of the street may be borne by the Agency, based upon denial of direct access to the west side of the connector from any properties outside the project area.

The Division of Traffic Engineering has not yet made a recommendation on whether, and how, the one-way directions of Tehama and Clementina Streets should be changed. Under consideration is a plan to retain Tehama west of the new connector as westbound, and to have Clementina two-way between the connector and 5th Street and one-way westbound between 4th Street and the connector.

The Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation considered the proposed vacation on July 10 and July 24, and has held the matter on its agenda for consideration of alternate possibilities such as the use of air rights over Tehama Street.

The housing project is on the western edge of the redevelopment project. To the west and outside of the redevelopment project are several printing establishments along Howard Street with access on Tehama, the Emporium furniture warehouse and its service building, both of which depend on Tehama Street for truck access, several smaller industrial establishments also dependent on Tehama Street, and St. Patrick's Family Center and several industrial uses on Clementina Street.

The latest plans for the housing project show an entrance to eleven of its required parking spaces from the connector. The other eighteen parking spaces are located in the panhandle, which was intended to connect the project with Howard Street, and they are accessible from Tehama Street.

One of the buildings of the housing development will project approximately 7 feet into the present sidewalk area of Tehama Street.

Tehama is thought to be an easement street. The Redevelopment Agency is now negotiating for the access rights of the owner of the only parcel (Lot 88) abutting the proposed vacation which may remain in its present industrial use.

George Paulsen, representing the Emporium, emphasized that his firm did not oppose the redevelopment plan for the Yerba Buena Center; however, he felt that it was essential that the new connector street between Tehama Street and Clementina Street should be constructed before the subject portion of Tehama Street is vacated. He stated that a great number of trucks use Tehama Street for access to the Emporium warehouse; and, for that reason, it was extremely important that through access should continue to be provided.

The Director recommended that he be authorized to report that the vacation of the subject portion of Tehama Street is in conformity with the Master Plan provided that access satisfactory for trucks is available at all times to the portion of Tehama Street west of the vacated area.

Commissioner Porter suggested that the recommendation should be changed to provide that permanent access satisfactory for trucks to the portion of Tehama Street west of the area to be vacated is made available before the vacation takes place.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the vacation of a portion of Tehama Street beginning one hundred feet west of Fourth Street and extending westerly for 175 feet, as shown on SUR-2069, is in conformity with the Master Plan, provided that permanent access satisfactory for trucks through the portion of Tehama Street west of the area to be vacated is made available before the vacation takes place.

R69.41 Revocable permit to occupy portion of Harrison Street between Army Street and Presidio Avenue with six portable classrooms.
Samuel Jung, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"The Board of Education has requested a revocable encroachment permit to occupy a portion of Harrison Street between Army Street and Precita Avenue with six temporary classrooms to accommodate the 117 children who are now being bussed to other schools because of overcrowding at LeConte elementary school.

Harrison Street is 82.5 feet wide with 15-foot sidewalks and a 52.5-foot roadway. The school is on the west side of the street with dwellings on the east side. The proposal is to place the temporaries partially on the sidewalk and partially in the roadway, leaving an 8-foot sidewalk between the buildings and the school's property line. The

buildings would project 21 feet into the roadway. A 6" by 6" wheelguard would be placed with its outer edge 2 feet from the buildings. This arrangement leaves enough room for a moving traffic lane in each direction plus a parking lane on the east side of the street; a 12-foot lane adjacent to the temporary classrooms and a 17.5-foot lane on the east side of the street.

There will be chain link protective fences at each end of the row of temporaries, plus a metal beam barrier at the north end of the street to deflect right-turn traffic from Army Street, plus appropriate striping. Police Department signs, "No Stopping at Any Time," will be posted along the walls of the classrooms. This arrangement is satisfactory as to traffic, according to Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation.

The present enrollment at LeConte school, kindergarten through the 6th grade, is 918; the 1948 Engelhardt report gave 710 as the optimum enrollment. The school has 24 classrooms plus kindergarten space. Last year 117 children were bussed out, 37 of them to Patrick Henry School on Potrero Hill and 80 to Monroe and Excelsior Schools in the Excelsior district. The Board of Education's decision to provide temporary classrooms was in response to a request from the Mission Coalition.

The New Buena Vista Elementary School at 25th and Utah Streets will open this fall and because of a boundary change will be able to take some children from LeConte's present service area.

The LeConte school site is about 1-1/2 acres in size, of which about 1/2 an acre is occupied by the building. The 1948 Engelhardt report recommended enlarging the playground by acquiring some properties to the west, which was never done. To the south across Precita Avenue is Bernal Park, otherwise known as Precita Green, which cannot be used as a school playground or as a site for the temporary classrooms for jurisdictional reasons.

Acquisition of properties to the west of the school would provide an off-street site for the temporary

classrooms and would, if enrollment drops in the future, provide for a larger school playground. The temporaries are 28 by 35 feet and so cannot be cited on a 25-foot lot. Acquisition of four lots, two facing on Precita Avenue and two facing on Army Street, should accommodate the classrooms. These lots are occupied by three single-family dwellings and one two-flat building.

The City Planning Commission assented to the use of Highland Avenue for temporary classrooms for Junipero Serra Elementary School in a similar referral earlier this year. However, it is now planned to place the classrooms at the reservoir a block away where there is sufficient space, a much better solution to the problem."

President Fleishhacker asked if the subject portion of Harrison Street carries a great deal of traffic. Mr. Jung replied in the negative.

Commissioner Newman asked how the portable classrooms would be separated from moving traffic. Mr. Jung replied that six-inch by six-inch wooden bumper guards would run alongside the portable classrooms; and a steel barrier would be constructed at the intersection of Army Street and Harrison Street to prevent vehicles making right turns from hitting the portable classrooms.

Commissioner Kearney remarked that less street area would be required for the portable classrooms if the sidewalk on the west side of Harrison Street were to be eliminated.

The Director stated that the subject proposal had been submitted to the Department of City Planning for review at a very late date in view of the fact that the portable classrooms would have to be in operation by September. In his opinion, the classrooms would be dangerously located in spite of the steel barrier and wooden curb blocks which were to be installed; and, because the classrooms would be located only two or three feet away from moving traffic, he felt that they would provide an extremely poor teaching environment. Furthermore, he remarked that no specific information had been provided regarding future plans for the LeConteSchool or the duration of time which the temporary portable classrooms might be expected to remain; and he noted that the offices of the Department of City Planning are located in a "temporary building" which was constructed more than 25 years ago. While he sympathized with the neighborhood's desire for additional classrooms at the LeConte School so that elementary-aged children would not have to be bussed to other locations, he felt that the proposal which had been submitted left much to be desired. Under the circumstances, he recommended that the proposed revocable permit be disapproved as in conflict with the Master Plan

because the street would not provide a suitable educational environment. He further recommended that the Board of Education acquire sufficient additional land to the west of LeConte School in order to site the proposed six temporary classrooms off the street.

Jerry Schimmel, director of the Mission Precita Center, stated that he had worked closely with residents of the subject neighborhood who were extremely anxious to increase the amount of classroom space at LeConte School. He agreed with the Director's criticism of the proposed portable classrooms; however, because of the emergency of the situation, he hoped that the portable classrooms would be approved for the location proposed until more sophisticated plans can be developed. If the portable classrooms are not installed by September, approximately 250 children would have to be bussed to other schools.

Commissioner Mellon asked if any consideration had been given to locating the portable classrooms on the Parkway in the middle of precita Avenue. The Director replied that use of the park space for such purposes would involve jurisdictional problems.

Commissioner Mellon noted that heavy trucks are allowed to use the subject portion of Harrison Street; and, if one of those trucks should hit one of the portable classrooms, the results might be disastrous.

Mr. Schimmel stated that he would be opposed to having the portable classrooms located on the Precita green because the subject neighborhood already has a shortage of usable open space.

Commissioner Porter asked if it would be feasible to close Harrison Street entirely in the subject block. The Director replied in the negative, indicating that access would have to be provided to the private properties located on the east side of Harrison Street. Subsequently, he recommended that the matter be taken under advisement in order to give the Board of Education an opportunity to formulate alternate proposals and to develop a specific program for expansion of the school so that everyone would have a better idea about the length of time which the "temporary" portable classrooms would remain in use.

Donald Rhodes, Assistant Superintendent of Schools for Elementary Education, stated that it was hoped that funds for purchase of property on the west side of LeConte School, as recommended in the Director of Planning's memorandum on the subject case, could be made available through a forthcoming Bond Issue. However, during the interim, he hoped that the Commission would approve the revocable permit even if a specific period of time were to be specified. At the same time, he felt that Harrison Street in the subject block should become a one-way street with one traffic lane and parking space. In conclusion, he stated that the portable classrooms would have no windows facing in the street; the windows would be located on the opposite side of the buildings.

The Director remarked that windows located eight feet from a blank wall would not be very desirable.

Mr. Rhodes described the present overcrowded condition of LeConte School which had resulted even though students were being bussed to other locations; and he indicated that it would be desirable to make use of the portable classrooms both to overcome the bussing problem and to return certain facilities of the school, such as the auditorium, to their normal use.

A Resident of the subject neighborhood stated that the number of students being bussed has increased every year; and, while the portable classrooms would provide an immediate solution for that problem, he felt that the ultimate solution would be to build a completely new school. She stated that Mayor Alioto had promised that portable classrooms would be made available; and she emphasized that they would have to be ready by September.

Commissioner Porter asked if the matter could be taken under advisement only one week instead of the two weeks recommended by the Director. The Director replied that one week would be satisfactory with him if the Board of Education could develop alternatives within that period of time.

Mrs. Dobkiski, a member of the Parents Committee of the LeConte School, agreed that the proposed solution to the problem being considered was not the most ideal; however, it seemed to be the only approach which would provide additional classroom space by September. Under the circumstances, she strongly urged that the revocable permit be approved so that students attending LeConte School would not have to be bussed to other locations or be subjected to double sessions.

Commissioner Porter asked if a check had been made on the amount of traffic using the subject portion of Harrison Street. The Director replied in the negative and emphasized that he was not so much concerned about the amount of traffic on the street as he was about the fact that any traffic on the street would pass within two feet of the portable classrooms. He stated that he recognized the problem being faced by residents of the area and by the Board of Education; and he was equally anxious to find a solution to the problem. However, he did not feel that the Department of City Planning should be placed in the position of having to "rubber stamp" the proposal because of the deadline now being faced to provide additional classroom space by September. The proposal should have been submitted to the Department of City Planning for review much earlier.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the subject referral be taken under advisement until the meeting of August 7, 1969.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Mellon absented himself from the meeting room for the remainder of the meeting. The Director also absented himself from the meeting room temporarily.

R69.42 Turnkey Housing Project for the Elderly, between Hermann Street and Duboce Avenue, between Fillmore and Steiner Streets.

Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator, reported on this matter as follows:

"The subject site, which is zoned R-4, is within approximately two blocks of stores, restaurants, and various personal services along Market Street, the Safeway Store at Church and Market Streets being the largest such facility. Duboce Park, on the north side of Duboce Avenue immediately west of the subject site, contains indoor facilities for adult activities as well as providing open space. Residential development in the immediately surrounding R-4 and R-3 zoned area is low- and medium-density in occupancy, and low-rise in height. The topography to the east, north and south of subject site is relatively flat; to the west the grade rises. Public transit is provided the subject site by the N-Judah streetcar line along Duboce Avenue and several bus lines within one block of the site. Franklin Hospital is approximately one block to the west.

The subject site has frontages of 30.5 feet on Duboce Avenue and 55.25 feet on Hermann Street and is 9,400 square feet in area. Under the Planning Code a maximum of 47 dwelling units would be permitted. Most of the subject site is currently vacant; the remainder is occupied by nonconforming storage buildings.

Preliminary plans for the proposed housing by Violeta Autumn, architect, are for four floors of residential occupancy over a level of parking for six cars entered from Hermann Street. The building is proposed to contain 34 studio units and 8 one-bedroom units; the total floor area is approximately 25,600 square feet. Garden areas are provided along the Duboce Avenue frontage and in a central court.

An application for variances from the parking requirements of the Planning Code, which otherwise requires the provision of 21 spaces for 42 units of elderly housing, has been heard but not yet decided, by the Zoning Administrator.

In June 1969, the Planning Commission found that a proposed 100 unit turnkey housing project on the southeast corner of Duboce Avenue and Sanchez Street opposite the subject site was in conformity with the Master Plan."

Commissioner Porter asked about the size of the studio apartments and questioned whether the buildings would have elevators. Mr. Passmore replied that he believed that the buildings would have elevators; and he indicated that the studios would have a floor area of approximately 400 square feet.

Commissioner Porter then asked if the studio apartments would have kitchens and bathrooms. A representative of the Housing Authority replied in the affirmative.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, recommended that the proposed development be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

President Fleishhacker, noting that the applicants proposed to construct only six parking spaces for the facility, asked what would happen if the building were to be occupied by younger people at some future date. Mr. Passmore replied that there is presently a great need for housing for the elderly; and, under the circumstances, he thought that the possibility of the building being occupied by younger people was extremely remote.'

Mr. Steele stated that he had not yet rendered an opinion on the parking variance which had been requested by the applicant. The site itself would accommodate a larger number of parking spaces; however, if they were to be provided, certain amenities would be lost.

The representative of the Housing Authority stated that statistics indicated that only three parking spaces would be necessary to serve the inhabitants of the project; however, additional parking spaces were being provided to accommodate guests.

Commissioner Porter asked about the source of the statistics which had been cited. Mr. Steele replied that the Housing Authority had made surveys to determine the need for resident and visitor parking in housing projects for the elderly.

Commissioner Porter asked if the subject property is located close to bus lines. Mr. Passmore replied in the affirmative, noting on the map the alternatives which would be available to residents on the project.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Kearney, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the development of the subject site, Lots 4, 18, and a portion of 21 in Assessor's Block 875, for Turnkey Housing for low-income elderly persons, is in conformity with the Master Plan.

R118.69.5 Tentative condominium subdivision maps,
1280 Ellis Street Apartments.

Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator, stated that the applicants proposed to subdivide an existing twelve-unit building which had originally been constructed as one of six twelve-unit dwellings built by Joseph Eichler, Inc., and known as Laguna Heights Apartments. The mortgage on the subject building was foreclosed, and the building is currently owned by the Federal Housing Administration who now proposed to sell the building as a condominium. The building, which is three floors high over a twelve-car parking garage, is fully occupied. He stated that the creation of a condominium would have no affect on the physical nature and general occupancy of the existing building.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Kearney, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the tentative condominium subdivision map, "1280 Ellis Street Apartments", pages 1 through 3 received by the Department of City Planning July 18, 1969, be approved as submitted.

PRESENTATION OF STAFF REPORT ON ISSUES IN HOUSING

Peter Groat, Planner IV, and Judith Lynch, Planner II, presented and summarized the report entitled "Issues in Housing" which is available in the files of the Department of City Planning. During the course of their presentation, the Director returned to the meeting room and reassumed his chair.

After concluding their report, Mr. Groat and Miss Lynch responded to questions raised by members of the Commission.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectively submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Administrative Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, August 7, 1969.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, August 7, 1969, at 2:15 p.m. at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Mortimer Fleishhacker, President; James J. Finn, Thomas J. Mellon, Walter S. Newman, and Mrs. Charles B. Porter, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: William M. Brinton and James S. Kearney.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director - Implementation; Marie Carlberg, Planner III; Daniel Sullivan, Planner II; and Donald Gralnek, Planning Intern; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, informed the Commission that the staff of the Department of City Planning had played two evening baseball games with the staff of DeLeuw Cather whose offices are located directly across the street from 100 Larkin Street. The Department of City Planning won both games, Wednesday night's score being 22-21.

The Director advised the Commission that preliminary design plans for the 16th and 24th Street BART stations on Mission Street are proceeding according to schedule.

The Director stated that an application for Federal funds for acquisition of the South San Francisco Opera House will be completed and submitted by the end of the week.

R69.41 Revocable permit to occupy portion of Harrison Street between Army Street and Precita Avenue with six portable classrooms (under advisement from meeting of July 31, 1969).

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, remarked that this matter had been taken under advisement from the meeting of July 31 in order to provide time for the Board of Education to develop alternate proposals for siting of the portable classrooms and to clarify the length of time which the temporary structures might be used. In the interim, members of the staff of the Department of City Planning had met with representatives of the Board of Education and had come up with a solution to the problem. The Superintendent of Schools had indicated a willingness to acquire additional property to the west of the LeConte School over a three-year period; at the same time, the Superintendent of Schools had suggested that the size of the vacated street area be expanded to allow for construction of a sidewalk along the street side of the portable

classrooms. As a result of those modifications, he was prepared to recommend that the proposed revocable permit does not affect the Master Plan provided that the portable classrooms are located in the street for no more than three years and that the Board of Education acquires property on which to locate the classrooms off the street within three years, preferably sooner. He also suggested that a wider separation than the two feet shown on Drawing STR-4481, Change 1, at least eight feet wide, should be made between traffic and the portable classrooms and that that area should be improved as a sidewalk with a curb.

The Director felt that the modified proposal would be much more satisfactory in terms of safety; and of equal importance was the fact that a commitment had been obtained from the Superintendent of Schools that additional property would be acquired for the LeConte School site. Under the circumstances, he felt that the week's delay had been most productive.

President Fleishhacker agreed that the modified proposal was far superior to that which had previously been urged upon the Commission. He emphasized however, that a "revocable" permit was being requested; and he felt that the Commission would be prepared to recommend revocation of the permit at a future date if no steps are taken to acquire additional property for the LeConte School during the three-year period.

Commissioner Mellon asked about the width of the street right-of-way which would be left to accommodate the one-way traffic flow. Mr. Steele replied that the usable width of the remaining street would be 23 feet six inches, an amount of space sufficient for one moving lane of traffic and for parking.

Mr. Vestnys, representing the Board of Education, stated that it was hoped that the portable classrooms could be relocated before the expiration of the three-year period.

Commissioner Finn questioned whether the remaining street area would provide sufficient access for emergency vehicles. The Director replied that the one-way traffic lane which would be provided would be as wide as most traffic lanes, if not wider.

Commissioner Mellon remarked that one-way northbound traffic would appear to provide a safer situation than one-way southbound traffic. The Director stated that his initial reaction had been similar; however, the Traffic Engineering Bureau of the Department of Public Works had recommended that northbound traffic would be preferable. He stated that his only strong feeling on the matter was that traffic should flow in the direction which would be safest.

Joe Edmiston, President of the Mission Precita Center, stated that the members of his organization joined the Director of Planning in not wishing to have the temporary classrooms located in the middle of Harrison Street on a permanent basis; and, consequently, they found the revised plan to be acceptable. Since very little traffic uses the subject portion of Harrison Street, he did not foresee any difficulties with the proposal.

Commissioner Mellon remarked that the barrier to be constructed at Army Street should be strong enough to stop heavy vehicles such as trucks or buses. Mr. Vestnys replied that a steel barrier similar to those used on highways was being considered; and he felt that such a barrier would provide adequate protection.

A member of the audience asked how long it would be before the temporary classrooms could be installed. Mr. Vestnys replied that the classrooms would be installed before October 1.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to submit the following report:

> "The proposed revocable permit to occupy a portion of Harrison Street between Army Street and Precita Avenue with six portable classrooms does not affect the Master Plan, provided that the portable classrooms are located in the street for no more than three years, and that the Board of Education acquires property on which to locate the classrooms off the street within three years, and preferably sooner; and provided that a wider separation than the two feet shown on Drawing STR-4481, Change 1, at least eight feet wide, is made between traffic and the portable classrooms, and is improved as a sidewalk with a curb; and provided that fencing is erected to protect the classrooms from possible vehicle accident; and provided further that a substantial traffic barrier is constructed at the southwest corner of Harrison and Army Streets."

The Commission also authorized the Director to report administratively that the purchase of four or five additional properties west of LeConte School would be found in conformity with the Master Plan when such a referral is received.

At 2:35 p.m. President Fleishhacker announced that the meeting was recessed. Members of the Commission then proceeded to Room 282, City Hall, and reconvened at 3:00 p.m. for hearing of the remainder of the agenda. Commissioner Mellon absented himself from the remainder of the meeting.

<u>3:00 p.m. - Room 282, City Hall</u>

CU67.13 960 Haight Street, north line, east of Broderick Street; and Broderick Street, east line, between 112.5 feet and 137.5 feet north of Haight Street.
Request for 100-bed convalescent hospital for long-term psychiatric care on property zoned R-3 and R-4 (under advisement from meeting of July 3, 1969).

Joe Williams, attorney for the applicant, requested that this matter be continued under advisement for at least one month to allow time for him and his client to coordinate their proposed program with Doctor Stubblebine of the Department of Public Health.

Dr. Stubblebine, who was present in the audience, believed that a one-month period should provide sufficient time to review the applicant's proposal

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Finn, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the subject application be continued under advisement until the Commission's meeting of September 4, 1969.

S69.1 Lombard Street, south line, between Van Ness Avenue and 125 feet west of Van Ness Avenue. Request for abolition of existing 28-foot setback line along the Lombard Street frontage and the 50-foot radius quarter setback line at the intersection of Van Ness Avenue and Lombard Street.

President Fleishhacker advised the Commission that he had received a telegram from Mrs. J. Paoli requesting that the hearing of the subject application be postponed because some of the members of the Granard Terrace Association were unable to appear in opposition to the proposal since they were out of town. After noting that a number of people were present in the audience who wished to comment on the application, the Commission decided to proceed with the hearing as scheduled

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, stated that the front setback line had been established in 1940 along both sides of Lombard Street between Van Ness Avenue and Franklin Street for a right-of-way for a then proposed Lombard Street tunnel. Subsequently, in the 1950's and 1960's, the City Planning Commission had abolished the setback line on the lot in the middle of the north side of Lombard Street between Van Ness Avenue and Franklin Street in connection with the construction and later expansion of the Cable Motel. In 1960, the Commission abolished the setback line at the southeast corner of Lombard and Franklin Streets on State-owned land to allow its use as a parking lot for a motel. However, in 1963 and in 1967 the Commission had denied applications to remove the setback line established on the subject property. The applicant in the present instance proposed to construct a 162-room, 105-foot high hotel on the subject property; and, in order to make that project feasible, removal of the setback had been requested. In conclusion, Mr. Steele stated that the main pedestrian entrance to the motel would be on Van Ness Avenue as would the entrance to the 81-car garage which would be required to serve the motel.

Commissioner Porter, noting that the State Division of Highways had previously objected to removal of the setback line, asked about the present positio of that agency. Mr. Steele replied that the State Division of Highways had indicated that they no longer have an interest in maintaining the setback; however, the Traffic Engineering Bureau of the City's Department of Public Works had advised the staff of the Department of City Planning that retention of a partial setback on the site would be desirable.

Charles Richardson, attorney for Quality Courts Motel, Inc., the applicant, displayed a rendering which had been prepared of the proposed building which would be twelve stories in height and which would contain 140 rooms and seventy parking spaces. He stated that the motel, as designed, would meet the floor area ratio and height limit requirements of the City Planning Code. However, in order to construct the motel on the site within the established height limit, it would be necessary to have the setback abolished. Otherwise, it would not be financially feasible to construct a hotel on the property. He emphasized that the State Division of Highways had withdrawn its objection to removal of the setback;

and he indicated that he had received a letter from the Department of Public Works advising him that only a portion of the setback would be needed for future street improvement projects in the area. He believed that the setback line, as presently established, is unusually harsh; and he felt that the proposed motel would enhance the neighborhood. Under the circumstances, he hoped that the application would be approved by the Commission.

Commissioner Porter asked if the applicants own the subject property or is they only have an option to buy the site. Mr. Richardson replied that his clients have an option to buy the property which will expire in one month. The option would not be taken if the setback were not to be abolished.

Terry Andrews, representing the owner of a building located on Greenwich Street, remarked that traffic coming from the Golden Gate Bridge to Downtown San Francisco must make a right turn at the intersection of Lombard Street and Van Ness Avenue; and, if the existing setback were removed, people making the turn would not be able to see where they were going. He also pointed out that the proposed motel would have parking spaces for only one-half of its rooms; and, if it were to be constructed as proposed, he believed that it would place an additional burden on a neighborhood which already has more than its share of traffic and parking problems. Since the Department of Public Works had indicated that it has need of the setback, and since retention of the setback would be in the best interests of the City, he urged that the subject application be disapproved.

The Director pointed out that removal of the subject setback would not affect views to the north where traffic would be which might conflict with individuals making a right turn from Lombard Street onto the southbound lanes of Van Ness Avenue. A view to the right for people making right-hand turns did not seem to him to be of great significance.

Mr. Murphy, 1455 Greenwich Street, felt that the most significant point was that the proposed hotel could not be constructed as it had been designed if the setback were not abolished; and, in view of the traffic and parking congestion which already exists in the neighborhood, he felt that advantage should be taken of this opportunity to prevent the construction of a 162-room hotel which would be required to have only twenty parking spaces. While the applicants were presently proposing to construct a greater number of parking spaces than would be required by the City Planning Code, they could change their plans at a later date. By using the Van Ness Avenue frontage as the address for the new building, the applicants would be permitted to construct a "hotel" instead of a "motel"; and a "hotel" could be built with only one parking space for every eight rooms instead of one parking space for each room which would be required if a "motel" were being built. He felt that a motel would be more appropriate for the site which is, in effect, a part of the Lombard Street motel strip. In view of these factors, he urged that the subject application be disapproved.

D. E. Whitman, 33 Granard Terrace, remarked that morning rush-hour traffic on Lombard Street backs up for as many as three or four signals. Given the obvious traffic problems already existing in the neighborhood, he felt that the proposed project should be discouraged.

Mrs. Walter Dana, 1487 Greenwich Street, believed that the building proposed by the applicant should have been designed as a "motel" instead of a "hotel" with an off-street parking space for every room; and she thought that it should have been designed within the 40-foot height limit which governs new

developments along Lombard Street. She stated that parking is already a serious problem in the subject neighborhood; and that situation has been disturbing to her tenants. Under the circumstances, she felt that the requirement of one parking space for every eight rooms in the proposed hotel would be inadequate.

Responding to a question raised by President Fleishhacker, Mr. Steele stated that either a hotel or a motel could be constructed on the subject corner lot depending on which frontage the owner wished to use for address purposes; and, by choosing the Van Ness Avenue frontage for address purposes, the applicant would be permitted to construct a hotel on the site. While the City Planning Code does require only one parking space for every eight rooms in a hotel, the plans which had been submitted by the applicants indicated that one parking space would be provided for each two rooms in the proposed building.

Commissioner Porter remarked that the only matter before the Commission for review was the question of whether the existing setback should be abolished; and if favorable action were to be taken on the application, the Commission, in doing so, would not have any power to establish special conditions to govern features of the proposed building.

Mrs. Walsh, membership chairman for the Russian Hill Improvement Association, noted that a number of the members of her organization were present in the audience. She emphasized that the parking problem in the subject neighborhood is acute; and, for that reason, she felt that a motel, with one parking space for each room, would be more appropriate for the site than the hotel which was being proposed. Furthermore, in view of possible future changes of the approaches to the Golden Gate Bridge, she thought that it would be desirable to retain the existing setback in case a decision should be made to widen Lombard Stree

Edward McCall, representing the owner of the subject property, stated that the proposed hotel would be much more attractive than the service station which presently occupies the site. He also emphasized that the State Division of Highways had stated that the setback would no longer be needed for its original purpose as a right-of-way for possible Lombard Street tunnel.

Harry Preen, representing twelve families from the subject neighborhood, stated that he was opposed to abolition of the existing setback because the hotel which would be built if the setback were removed would be inconsistent with the essentially residential character of the area. He remarked that the setback had originally been established when the Commission had authorized use of the subject property for a gasoline service station; and the purpose of the setback was to make sure that the bulk of the property would remain undeveloped. If the setback were removed, and if a hotel with a height of 105 feet were to be constructed on the site, the value of other residential properties in the area would be depreciated

Commissioner Porter asked if abolition of the setback would allow the applicants to achieve a higher floor area ratio on the site. Mr. Steele replied in the negative, indicating that the setback area had been used in the floor area ratio computation for the site. However, if the setback were not removed, the applicants would not be able to construct a building to the maximum floor area ratio permitted.

Lester Curco felt that the Master Plan and zoning which had previously been established by the City Planning Commission were designed to accommodate everyone; and he believed that approval of the application would violate the principles of good City Planning. He stated that the parking situation in the subject neighborhood is bad at the present time; and he believed that the situation would become worse if the proposed hotel were constructed. It was his opinion that the application for abolition of the setback should be denied.

Martin Murphy, representing his mother who owns property on Granard Terrace, asked if he were correct in understanding that a motel could not be built on the subject site. Mr. Curco replied that a motel could be constructed on the site; however, the applicant had chosen to design a hotel.

Mr. Murphy believed that most of the patrons of the hotel would have automobiles; and he expected that those automobiles would inevitably be parked on the street, thus adding to the parking congestion in the area. He also noted that the proposed hotel would take away views from some existing buildings in the area.

Mr. Steele recommended disapproval of the application submitted for abolition of the full 28-foot setback and the 50-foot radius setback at the corner because of traffic improvement needs at the intersection. However, because the Traffic Engineering Bureau of the Department of Public Works had indicated that a 16-foot setback would be sufficient to accommodate future traffic improvements at the intersection, he was prepared to recommend approval of a modification which would provide a fifteen-foot setback along Lombard Street and a 30-feet radius setback at the intersection. He also recommended that a draft resolution be adopted by the Commission giving notice of its intent to consider modifying existing setbacks on the north side of Lombard Street in the subject area so that all of the setbacks would be consistent.

Commissioner Newman asked if the modified setback which had been recommended by Mr. Steele would make it feasible for the applicant to construct a hotel on the site. Mr. Richardson replied that he was not prepared to answer that question; however, it was obvious that certain modifications would have to be made in the plans for the building if the setback were not to be abolished completely.

The Director emphasized that the hotel building itself was not before the Commission for review; only the setback was under consideration. He regarded a 28-foot setback as being excessively large; and, since the Department of Public Works had indicated that they would require no more than a sixteen-foot setback to accommodate future traffic improvements at the intersection, he felt that the setback should be modified. In conclusion, he stated that he would be prepared to recommend modification of the setback regardless of the plans which were being prepared by the applicants for the site.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Newman and seconded by Commissioner Porter that the draft resolution be adopted and that the application be approved in part. Commissioner Porter remarked that the intersection of Lombard Street and Van Ness Avenue is one of the most difficult traffic areas in the City; and, for that reason, she felt that the modified setback of 16 feet which was now being established should be maintained and that any potential developer of the site should be aware of that fact.

Mr. Andrews asked if the Commission could legally refuse to modify the setback on the basis of the testimony which had been presented regarding traffic and parking problems in the area. The Director replied that the staff of the Department of City Planning was of the opinion that the proposed hotel would constitute an appropriate use for the subject site. Under other circumstances, they would have recommended that the zoning of the property be changed.

Mrs. Dana believed that the Board of Supervisors, in adopting the zoning ordinance, had intended to reserve Lombard Street for motels instead of hotels. It was obvious to her that the proposed hotel would not turn away people with automobiles even if no parking spaces were available on the site; and, under the circumstances, she thought that the existing setback should not be reduced to accommodate the sort of use which was being proposed.

Mr. Richardson remarked that people who had spoken in opposition to the subject application had raised zoning questions and had not directed their comments to the question of whether the existing setback is reasonable or not. He felt that the setback is unreasonable and that it should be modified.

After further discussion, the question was called and the Commission voted unanimously to adopt the draft resolution as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6409 and to approve a modification of the setback line to provide a setback of 16 feet along Lombard Street and a 30-foot radius setback at the intersection.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Finn, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6410 be adopted giving notice of the Commission's intent to hold a public hearing on September 4, 1969, to consider modification of setback lines on the north side of Lombard Street west of Van Ness Avenue.

CU69.43 2511-13 Bush Street, south line, 137.5 feet west of Scott Street. Request for a three-story medical office building in an R-4 district.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He noted that approximately one-half of the subject block is zoned R-4 and is developed with a two-family dwelling and a medical office building; and the remainder of the block is zoned C-2 and contains a hospital and medical office buildings. He stated that the City Planning Code would require a minimum of 28 parking spaces for a building of the size being proposed by the applicant; however, if necessary and appropriate, the parking spaces could be located elsewhere within a walking distance of 400 feet of the subject property. The plans which had been submitted by the applicant indicated that spaces for thirteen cars would be provided on site and that space for fifteen cars would be provided at a commercial garage within 400 feet of the proposed building.

Robert Rosenthal, architect for the applicant, described the plans which he had prepared for a three-story medical office building over a parking

garage. He pointed out that the subject neighbornood is presently in a transitional stage; and, because of the proximity of the subject site to Mount Zion Hospital, it seemed to be a desirable location for a medical office building. He stated that the parking spaces would be completely enclosed in the building; and the building would be adequately landscaped. As a result, he felt that the building would be an asset to the neighborhood. In conclusion, he submitted a letter from Emory W. Speck, proprietor of the Pacific Heights Garage located at 1740 Divisadero Street, confirming that fifteen parking cells would be made available to the applicant during office hours to fulfill the City Planning Code's requirements for parking for the proposed building.

Commissioner Porter asked how many doctors would occupy the building and what their specialties would be. Mr. Rosenthal replied that the building would contain a total of four suites which would house approximately seven physicians and their technical staffs. The physicians would specialize in internal medicine.

Commissioner Porter remarked that the required parking must have been based on a floor area ratio computation and not on the number of people who would be occupying the building.

Mr. Steele recommended adoption of a draft resolution of approval which he had prepared containing five conditions.

After reviewing the conditions contained in the draft resolution, Mr. Rosenthal indicated that he found the draft resolution to be satisfactory.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6411 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions recommended by Mr. Steele.

CU69.44 312-22 Baker Street, east line, 50 feet north of Fell Street.
Request for a mental health rehabilitation center for in-patient care for approximately seventy patients in an R-4 district.

Mr. Steele stated that he had received a letter from Francisco J. Centurion, architect for the applicant, requesting that hearing of the subject application be postponed until the Commission's meeting of September 4, 1969.

Mr. Centurion, who was present in the audience, stated that his client was working with various agencies in an effort to generate community involvement in the proposed project; and, as a result, it would be better if the hearing of the application could be postponed until October.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that hearing of the subject application be postponed until the Commission's meeting on October 2, 1969.

CU69.45 Westerly portion of block bounded by Washington, Montgomery, Clay and Sansome Streets.
Request for a parking garage in connection with the proposed Transamerica headquarters office building; in a C-3-O district.

President Fleishhacker stated that he had received a letter from Michael Doyle of the Environmental Workshop urging that consideration of the subject application be postponed until the Board of Supervisors has acted on the proposed closure of Merchant Street. However, since instruction of the proposed building would ultimately be contingent upon the street vacation, he felt that the Commission should proceed with this hearing as scheduled.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, stated that the Transamerica Corporation had proposed to construct an automobile parking garage as part of the proposed Transamerica headquarters office building. The parking would be arranged in three levels below-grade, covering the entire site, with a single entrance at the eastern edge of the site on Washington Street and a single exit at the eastern edge of the site on Clay Street. The number of parking stalls shown on the plan was approximately 280; however, the applicants had stated that up to 340 automobiles could be accommodated with use of aisle areas and attendant parking. The applicants had also stated that the parking facility would be for use of tenants in the daytime and that it would be open for public parking in the evening. The matter had come before the Commission in the form of a conditional use application because the off-street parking garage would exceed seven percent of the gross floor area of the building. However, in the past, the staff of the Department of City Planning had regarded parking to be a desirable use in the Portsmouth Corridor area which lies on the periphery of the financial district.

Sidney Roberts, attorney for the Transamerica Corporation, described the plans which had been prepared for the proposed garage and informed the Commission that only ten percent of the 340 parking spaces would be reserved for tenants of the building; the remainder of the spaces would be available to the public. He believed that the proposed facility would conform to the policy contained in the City Planning Commission's Downtown Plan which proposed that parking should be located along the periphery of the business district; and he also pointed out that the Downtown Parking and Traffic Survey which had been conducted by the Department of Public Works had recommended the Portsmouth Corridor as a desirable location for parking to ameliorate a deficiency of parking spaces projected for the year 1975. Furthermore, the Traffic Engineering Bureau of the Department of Public Works had indicated that the traffic which would be generated by the proposed Transamerica Building and its parking garage would not have a significant impact on traffic in the immediate area. Finally, Mr. Roberts indicated that the proposed garage would seem to meet the design terms of reference which had been recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning to his clients on February 24, 1969.

Sol Onorato, operator of the Portsmouth Square Garage, stated that he had reviewed the plans for the garage proposed by the Transamerica Corporation; and he felt that their architects had done an excellent job. Adequate reservoir

space would be provided; and the loading and unloading of trucks would take place within the garage itself instead of on the street where traffic would be blocked. Under the circumstances, he recommended that the subject application be approved.

Mr. Steele, also, felt that the proposed garage would be well-located and that it would not have a detrimental or adverse affect on traffic in the area. Therefore, he recommended the adoption of a draft resolution of approval which he had prepared.

President Fleishhacker asked how many parking spaces are presently available in the vicinity of the Transamerica site. Mr. Onaroto estimated that no more than 140 parking spaces are now available in that area.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Finn, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6412 be adopted and that the subject application be approved.

CU69.46 Dearborn Street, northeast corner of Bird Street
Request for an automobile parking lot in an R-2 district.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the application had been filed to legalize the use of the property as an employee and business parking lot for a bottling plant adjacent to the east at 630 Valencia Street. No direct connection between the bottling plant and the parking lot exists or is proposed.

Douglas R. Backeberg, representing the applicant, stated that his client wished to continue to use the subject property as an employee and visitor parking lot in conjunction with the adjacent bottling company. If the application were approved, the lot would be landscaped with trees and ivy to screen it from near-by residential buildings. Under those circumsances, he felt that the parking lot would be an asset to the neighborhood both in appearance and in its ability to alleviate parking congestion in the area.

President Fleishhacker asked how access would be gained to the bottling plant from the subject lot. Mr. Backeberg stated that access would continue to be gained across a vacant lot located at the end of Bird Street which is also used as a parking lot.

Edward A. Hammer, attorney for a neighboring property owner, stated that his client hoped that the application would be approved since use of the subject property for parking would relieve parking congestion in the area.

No one was present to speak in opposition to the application.

Mr. Steele recommended that the application be approved subject to six specific conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared. After summarizing the conditions, he recommended adoption of the draft resolution.

After reading the draft resolution, the applicant stated that he had no objection to the conditions which it contained.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6413 and that the application be approved subject to the conditions which had been recommended by Mr. Steele.

ZM69.18 The west side of Webster Street between Fulton and Ivy Streets; all of the block bounded by Fulton, Webster, Grove, and Buchanan Streets; that portion of the block bounded by Fulton, Buchanan, Ivy, and Laguna Streets which is presently zoned CM; and the block bounded by Grove, Webster, Ivy, and Buchanan Streets. CM to an R-3 district.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the proposed reclassification had been initiated by the City Planning Commission in light of the Alamo Square Federally Assisted Code Enforcement Program and the requirement of the Department of Housing and Urban Development that the zoning classification of the area be consistent with the residential character of the area. The reclassification had also been prompted by the request of the Redevelopment Agency for reclassification of adjacent properties within the redevelopment area A-2. Mr. Steele advised the Commission that the proposed reclassification would result in the creation of several nonconforming commercial and office uses which would be subject to the nonconforming use provisions of the Code. Such nonconforming commercial uses would be subject to termination twenty years from the date of reclassification and could not expand in area; however, during the twenty-year amortization period, the nonconforming uses could apply for conditional use status. In conclusion, he described the nature of the uses which would become nonconforming if the reclassification were approved.

Peter Witmer, President of the Alamo Square Association, stated that his Board of Directors had voted to support the proposed reclassification. They had been concerned about any hardships which might be occasioned by the proposed reclassification. They had been concerned about any hardships which might be occasioned by the proposed reclassification; however, since the area is essentially residential in character, they felt that the reclassification would be desirable. In any case, the F.A.C.E. program is essential to the neighborhood; and it would not be possible to extend that program unless the subject properties were reclassified residentially. Mr. Witmer stated that the subject properties had originally been zoned CM to accommodate a brewery which had been located in the area; however, in view of recent changes in the neighborhood, that zoning now seemed to be quite inappropriate. Mr. Witmer conceded that some commercial uses would not be detrimental to the neighborhood assuming that Webster Street, for instance, could be developed with an atmosphere similar to that which exists on Union Street; however, in the long run, he felt that the neighborhood would be better off if it were reclassified for residential use. He noted that no one had yet taken advantage of the present industrial zoning to any significant extent; and, if the industrial zoning were to be retained and exploited at some future date the effect might be extremely detrimental to the neighborhood.

Robert Reese, representing the Redevelopment Agency, stated that the proposed reclassification was in conformity with the official redevelopment plan for Project Area A-2. He pointed out, however, that the redevelopment plan called for the retention of a mortuary located on the south side of Fulton Street; and, since the proposed reclassification would turn the mortuary into a nonconforming use, the Redevelopment Agency would probably return to the Commission at a later date to request conditional use authorization for that operation.

President Fleishhacker asked where the nearest commercially zoned areas are located with respect to the subject properties. The Director replied that commercial zones exist along Fillmore Street in the redevelopment project area and in the vicinity of Market Street to the southeast of the subject property.

Marvin Edwards, 731 Grove Street, stated that he had circulated a petition in support of the proposed reclassification; and he felt that most of the property owners in the area were in favor of the action which the Commission proposed to take.

Richard Abbot, owner of property on Block 805, noted that many of the houses in the neighborhood are more than ninety years old; and he felt that they should be zoned residentially to conform to the manner in which they have been used. He acknowledged that the Victorian houses in the area are not architectural masterpieces; however, many of them are architecturally interesting. Under the circumstances, it would be unfortunate if they were to be demolished so that those properties could be used commercially.

Charles Whalen, 725 Webster Street, stated that he had spent a great deal of money remodeling his property; and he felt that the value of the property would be diminished if the zoning were changed as proposed by the Commission. He indicated that he had talked with other property owners along Webster Street; and they had all been opposed to the reclassification of their properties. At the present time Webster Street is developed with a number of commercial uses; and, when it is widened southward to Market Street, it will probably become even less desirable as a residential area. Under the circumstances, he hoped that the zoning along Webster Street would remain unchanged.

President Fleishhacker asked which side of Grove Street would be affected if the widening project were to be undertaken. Mr. Whalen replied that a setback had already been established along the side of the street opposite his property for the widening project.

President Fleishhacker asked why the proposed reclassification would lessen the value of Mr. Whalen's property. Mr. Whalen replied that he had found that it was not possible to keep good residential tenants on the subject portion of Webster Street.

Commissioner Porter asked if all of the properties owned by Mr. Whalen are leased commercially. Mr. Whalen replied that one of the buildings is used residentially.

Commissioner Porter then pointed out that the commercial uses could be continued for at least twenty years if the properties were to be reclassified.

Mr. Whalen acknowledged that fact; however, he had been advised that buildings with nonconforming use status are difficult to sell. He hoped that the CM zoning would be retained; and he indicated that he was confident that the various property owners along Webster Street would be willing to enter deed restrictions or other covenants which would assure that quality would be achieved in their commercial strip.

Bernard Pechter, 801 Grove Street, stated that his building is presently leased to a locksmith; and he felt that the value of his property would be considerably lessened if the locksmith were forced to move because of the reclassification being contemplated by the Commission. Furthermore, his lessee had obtained an option to buy the property and had proceeded to do a lot of work on the building; and, since the building would become worthless to him if it were reclassified to R-3, he would suffer a considerable loss because of the reclassification.

Mr. Steele advised Mr. Pechter that certain commercial uses could qualify as conditional uses in an R-3 district.

The Director felt that the twenty-year amortization period provided by the City Planning Code was equitable; and he indicated that no major hardship cases related to nonconforming use amortizations had ever come to his attention. He confirmed that the widening of Webster Street had been proposed; however, the position of the staff of the Department of City Planning was that the widening would not be desirable because of the number of people who would have to be relocated for such a project. He recommended that the subject properties be reclassified to R-3. Since the area is primarily residential in use, he felt that residential zoning would be appropriate. Furthermore, residential zoning would compliment the adjacent redevelopment project area and would make expansion of the F.A.C.E. program feasible.

Commissioner Porter asked if the Redevelopment Agency had any specific plans for development of commercial activities on any of the subject properties. Mr. Reese replied in the negative.

Frank Kukula, owner of property located at 751 Webster Street, stated that he had applied for a permit for remodeling and expansion of his building; and he wondered if that permit would be affected by the proposed reclassification. Mr. Steele replied that the expansion could not be approved if the property were reclassified; however, he would be able to file a conditional use application at any time during the next twenty years.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6414 be adopted and that the subject application be approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Administrative Secretary

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, September 4, 1969.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, September 4, 1969, at 2:15 p.m. at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Mortimer Fleishhacker, President; James S. Kearney, Vice President; Walter S. Newman, and Mrs. Charles B. Porter, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: Commissioners William M. Brinton, James K. Carr, and Thomas J. Mellon.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation; Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator; Samuel Jung, Planner IV; Charles Kroupa, Planner III (Zoning); Daniel Sullivan, Planner II; Jack Seto, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meetings of August 7, 14, and 21, 1969, be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, recommended the adoption of three draft resolutions endorsing in principle the bond issues for the Recreation and Park Department, the Unified School District, and the multi-purpose improvement bond issue which will appear on the November ballot.

Commissioner Newman asked for a more detailed description of the recreation and park bond issue; and Mr. Jung subsequently described the various projects which had been included in that bond issue.

President Fleishhacker asked when the last bond issue had been approved for the Recreation and Park Department. Mr. Jung replied that the last bond issue for that department had been approved in 1958.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Kearney, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6416 be adopted and that the proposed bond issue for the Recreation and Park Department be endorsed in principle.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Kearney, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6417 be adopted endorsing in principle the proposed bond issue for the Unified School District.

Finally, it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Kearney, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6418 be adopted endorsing

in principle the proposed multi-purpose municipal improvement bond.

The Director reminded the Commission that the Regular Meeting of Thursday, September 11, 1969, at 2:15 p.m. had been canceled and that a Special Meeting had been scheduled for 8:00 that evening at the South San Francisco Opera House. He also suggested that a special meeting should be scheduled for Friday, September 12, 1969, at 2:15 p.m. to consider development criteria for Alcatraz Island.

The Commission listened to a complaint from Miss Gertrude Barnett concerning a billboard located adjacent to her property on the south side of Broadway between Van Ness Avenue and Polk Street and advised her that the City's sign control ordinance specifically prohibits the Commission from exercising its discretion over billboards. The Commission suggested that she should obtain legal counsel to aid her in finding a way to have the billboard removed.

At 2:55 p.m. President Fleishhacker announced that the meeting was recessed. Members of the Commission then proceeded to Room 282, City Hall, and reconvened at 3:00 p.m. for hearing of the remainder of the calendar. The Director absented himself from the remainder of the meeting.

3:00 P.m. - Room 282, City Hall

Frank Kukula, the initiator of Application CU67.13 which appeared as the first item on the Commission's agenda, asked that hearing of his application be deferred pending the arrival of his attorney. The Commission acceded to his request.

CU69.48 6021 Geary Boulevard, south line, 82.5 feet west of 24th Avenue.
Request for a used car sales lot in a C-2 district.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that no automobile sales lots presently exist along Geary Boulevard west of Park Presidio Boulevard; however, the sale of used cars is conducted within an entirely enclosed building near the northwest corner of Geary Boulevard and 21st Avenue. He stated that the applicant owns an automobile repair garage immediately adjacent to the subject site; and a sign on that garage indicates that a minor amount of sales may be conducted from within that building.

Mr. Minetti, representing the applicant, stated that the subject property had been purchased approximately three months ago. The property had been used to store automobiles which have been repaired until such time as they are picked up by their owners. Occasionally, people would rather sell their automobiles than have to pay the repair fee; and, in such cases, the automobiles have to be resold to the public. Mr. Minetti estimated that approximately three or four automobiles are handled in this manner each month; and the purpose of the subject application was to make it possible to use the subject lot for sale of those automobiles.

No one else was present to speak in favor of the application.

Lewis Lindsay asked if adjacent property owners had been advised of the present hearing. Following Mr. Steele's reply that all property owners within a radius of three hundred feet of the subject site had been notified of the hearing, Mr. Lindsay stated that he did not wish to oppose the application if adjacent property owners had no objection to the proposed use; however, he felt that no further action should be taken by San Francisco to accommodate automobiles.

Harold Retler suggested that the automobile sales lot should be screened from the street by fencing or shrubbery if it were to be approved by the Commission.

Mr. Steele stated that he had received a telephone call from the owner of an apartment building which abuts the rear of the subject lot; and that individual had indicated that he was opposed to the application. Mr. Steele noted that the Master Plan designates the vicinity of the subject property for low to medium density residential use; and, while the C-2 district along Geary Boulevard provides service to the residents of the neighborhood, he did not feel that the proposed used car lot could be considered to be a neighborhood service. Furthermore, no public need had been shown for a used car lot at the subject location. He noted that a concentration of used car lots is presently established east of Park Presidio Boulevard on Geary Street; and other major concentrations of such facilities are located elsewhere in the City. He felt that it would be desirable to encourage such concentrations and to discourage individual used car lots outside of those areas, particularly where such individual lots might be considered as precedents for the expansion of automobile sales lots into areas which are not presently devoted to such a use. Under the circumstances, he recommended that the subject application be disapproved.

President Fleishhacker stated that he saw little difference between automobile storage which would be permitted as a principle use of the subject site and automobile sales which was being requested by the applicant. Mr. Steele agreed; and he acknowledged that the applicant anticipated only a low volume of sales on the site. However, if the subject application were approved, a precedent would be established which could lead to a proliferation of such uses in the area to the detriment of the neighborhood.

No one spoke in rebuttal to Mr. Steele's recommendation.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6419 be adopted and that the subject application be disapproved.

CU69.47 Southwest corner of Sacramento and Stockton Streets.
Request for an automobile parking lot in a C-3-G district.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to

land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the property had formerly been developed with a service station and accessory parking; however, at the present time the lot is vacant. The applicant had requested permission to use the property as a parking lot with seventeen independently accessible parking spaces.

Alvin Zelver, planning consultant for the owners of the subject property, stated that the proposed parking lot would be of the "self-park" variety; and he indicated that landscaping plans had been prepared for the site.

Commissioner Porter asked if the applicants would be willing to install the landscaping if the subject application were approved by the Commission. Mr. Zelver replied in the affirmative.

President Fleishhacker remarked that the subject property is already being used as a parking lot. Mr. Zelver replied that people had been parking on the property without the permission of his client; and he indicated that no fees had been collected.

No one else was present to speak in favor of the application.

Harold Retler, 239 Lombard Street, stated that he was opposed to any street level parking being permitted in the vicinity of the subject property; and he felt that it was a crime that such excellent property should be allowed to remain fallow and to collect rubble. Furthermore, given the need for additional housing in San Francisco, he was d smayed at the number of properties which are increasingly being used for parking. He felt that existing buildings should not be allowed to be demolished; however, once buildings have been demolished, he believed that the Commission should not encourage parking lots at the expense of housing. In conclusion, he suggested that parking lots should be discouraged by leveling higher assessments against such uses.

Lewis Lindsay stated that he was in agreement with the comments which had been made by Mr. Retler.

Reverend Burt Tom, representing the Chinatown Presbyterian Church, stated that he did not oppose or support the subject application; however, if the application were to be approved, he felt that the parking lot should be landscaped and that it should be well-lit so that it would not become a dangerous spot at night.

Mr. Steele felt that the parking lot would constitute an interim use of the subject property; and, therefore, he recommended that the application be approved subject to five conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for review by the Commission.

Commissioner Porter suggested that Condition No. 4 of the draft resolution should be changed to require that artifical lighting be provided for the lot. Mr. Steele recommended that the following language be used for that condition:

"Artificial lighting of low intensity shall be provided and shall be deflected downward and away from surrounding residential areas.:

Mr. Zelver stated that his clients were aware of the need for adequate security.

Mr. Retler asked if the owners of the subject property have any plans for its future development. Mr. Zelver replied in the affirmative; however, he indicated that the actual planning of the project would depend on many factors.

President Fleishhacker assured Mr. Retler that the Commission was not unsympathetic to the need for additional housing in San Francisco; however, the Commission had no authority to require that properties be developed in a specific way. If the parking lot were approved, he believed that it would constitute only an interim use of the site since the owners would not want to avail themselves of the economic advantages of having a building on the site at some future date.

Commissioner Porter felt that the proposed parking lot would be a desirable interim use if it were properly landscaped and lighted since it would replace an unsightly illegal parking lot.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Kearney, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6420 be adopted and that Application CU69.47 be approved subject to the five conditions contained in the draft resolution as modified.

CU67.13 960 Haight Street, north line, east of Broadway Street; and Broderick Street, east line, between 112.5 feet and 137.5 feet north of Haight Street. Request for a 100-bed convalescent hospital for long-term psychiatric care on property zones R-3 and R-4. (Under advisement from meeting of August 7, 1969)

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, described the subject property and reviewed the history of the subject application. He stated that the application had been before the Commission on several occasions and had most recently been taken under advisement from the meeting of August 7 to allow the applicant to discuss his plans for the convalescent hospital with representatives of the Department of Public Health. On August 26 he had written a letter to the owner of the property requesting additional information regarding the application; however, that information had not been received to date.

Mr. Williams, attorney for the applicant, stated that the doctor who had been affiliated with his client ahad withdrawn from the project during the last month; however, before leaving the project, he had contacted the director of the Westside Community Mental Health Center who had had advised that the proposed facility would probably not be approved by

the Department of Public Health. In view of those circumstances, his client wished to change the nature of the application again to request permission to construct a 100-bed convalescent hospital on the site instead of the 120-bed convalescent hospital which had been proposed two years ago.

President Fleishhacker suggested that the subject application should be withdrawn and that the applicant should file a new application requesting permission to construct the convalescent hospital. Commissioner Porter remarked that such a procedure would make it necessary for the applicant to pay another filing fee; and, under the circumstances, she wondered if it would not be legally possible for the nature of the subject application to be changed.

Mr. Steele stated that several notices had had to be sent to surrounding property owners because of the changes which the applicant had made in his application; and that process had been quite expensive. He recommended that the application be disapproved.

Mr. Williams requested that the application be withdrawn rather than disapproved.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6421 be adopted and that withdrawal of the subject application be approved.

At 3:55 p.m. President Fleishhacker announced a five minute recess. The Commission reconvened at 4:00 p.m. and proceeded with hearing of the remainder of the calendar.

ZM69.20 Hopkins Avenue, north and south sides, between Burnett Avenue and Corbett Avenue. R-1 to an R-2 district.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that eleven lots with a total area of 30,611 square feet had been included in the application. Five lots are on the north side of Hopkins Avenue with a total frontage of 234 feet and an average depth of 92 feet; six lots are on the south side of Hopkins with a total frontage of 238 feet and an average depth of 100 feet. Eight of the eleven subject lots are occupied by single-family dwellings. One lot, that owned by the applicant, is occupied by a single-family dwelling with an illegal second dwelling unit. Two of the lots are presently vacant. The application had been filed requesting reclassification of the lots from R-1 to R-2 in order to legalize the applicant's illegal dwelling unit.

George R. Bobbitt, the applicant, stated that the addition which he had made to his property had been declared illegal because it contains a kitchen. He stated that taxes had increased twice since he had purchased his property; and, therefore, it was economically important to him that the

additional dwelling unit be retained. Mr. Bobbitt pointed out that most of the properties in the subject neighborhood, with the exception of the eleven included in the subject application, are already zoned for higher density residential construction; and he felt that the owners of the subject properties should be afforded a similar advantage. Since most of the owners of the other properties in question did not seem to be present in the audience, he felt it safe to assume that they were not interested in the application. Under the circumstances, he urged that the application be approved.

President Fleishhacker remarked that everyone's taxes had increased as a result of recent rate increases in San Francisco.

Mr. Bobbitt acknowledged that fact; however, he felt that the property owners should be given some opportunity to raise additional money to meet the increasing tax burden.

President Fleishhacker asked if Mr. Bobbitt felt that all property zoned R-1 in San Francisco should be rezoned to R-2. Mr.Bobbitt replied that he felt that all R-1 property presently surrounded by an R-2 zoning district should be reclassified.

President Fleishhacker then remarked that changing of the zoning from R-1 to R-2 would probably result in an increase of the assessed value of the property; and taxes would then be increased even more.

Mr. Rush, 29 Hopkins Avenue, submitted a petition which had been signed by the owners of six of the subject properties in opposition to the request for rezoning. He stated that one of the remaining lots is vacant and another is not presently owner-occupied. Mr. Rush felt that the applicant had lied to the building inspector when he gave assurances that the additions to his own property would be for his own use and not for rental purposes; and since the applicant had already rented the other portion of the house and moved into the downstairs portion, he assumed that the downstairs apartment would eventually be rented, also, and that the applicant would move elsewhere.

President Fleishhacker stated that the Commission was well aware that the additional unit in the applicant's home is illegal; however, the issue before the Commission was not the legality of the apartment but whether the property should be rezoned to R-2 as requested by the applicant. Mr. Rush urged that the properties be allowed to retain their R-1 zoning.

Mr. Simini, owner of two of the subject lots, indicated that he, also, was opposed to the subject application. If the properties were reclassified, all of their assessments would be raised; and, as a result, the owners of ten of the properties involved in the application would have to pay higher taxes for their single-family homes.

Mr. Hexberg, owner of property located on Burnett Avenue., reminded the Commission that residents of the subject neighborhood had consistently opposed reclassification of the neighborhood from R-1 to a higher density residential district; and he felt that the majority of the property owners

should prevail. He noted that most of the owners of the subject property would not be able to avail themselves of the higher density which would be allowed by the proposed R-2 zoning district; and, as a result, approval of the application would have little affect other than to legalize an apartment which had been constructed because the applicant chose to break the law. In conclusion, he remarked that Hopkins Avenue is a heavily traveled street; and, for that reason alone, he felt that it would be quite undesirable to increase the density of the street.

The Secretary stated that he had received a letter from Mrs. Barham, owner of property on Burnett Avenue, in opposition to the proposed reclassification.

Mary Henderson, 44 Hopkins Avenue, stated that she already experiences a great deal of difficulty getting into and out of her garage because of the heavy traffic on the street; and, for that reason, she was opposed to the subject application which would bring increased density to the area.

Mr. Steele remarked that the subject properties had been in a single-family zoning area since the 1940's at the request of the property owners; and he noted that the property owners continued to oppose reclassification to a higher density area. He stated that the applicant had not demonstrated any necessity for changing the zoning of the subject properties except to legalize an illegal apartment unit; and he did not feel that the public convenience or general welfare would be enhanced or improved if the application were to be approved. Therefore, he recommended disapproval of the application.

Mr. Bobbitt thought that it was significant that more people were not present in the meeting room who own property within a 300-foot radius of the subject property; and he wondered if the matter could be taken under advisement so that he would have an opportunity to have those people sign a petition favoring the application. President Fleishhacker replied that it would not be fair to ask those people who were present to return another time; and if other individuals who had received notice of the meeting were not in attendance, he believed it was evident that they did not have strong feelings on the matter.

Mr. Bobbitt asked if disapproval of the subject application would prevent him from filing another application at some future date. Commissioner Porter advised Mr. Bobbitt that he could appeal the decision of the City Planning Commission to the Board of Supervisors. As far as she was concerned, however, reclassification of the subject properties would encourage conversion of the single-family homes which exist in the area; and such conversions would be extremely detrimental to the character of the area.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6422 be adopted and that the subject application be disapproved.

ZM69.19 1221-1231 Potrero Avenue, east line, ninety feet south of 24th Street.
R-4 to a C-2 district.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the Shell Oil Company had requested reclassification of the property from R-4 to C-2 in connection with the proposed construction of an automobile service station at the southeast corner of Potrero Avenue and 24th Street. The proposed reclassification would place in a C-2 district all of Lot 20, which lot has total frontages of 150 feet on Potrero Avenue and 100 feet on 24th Street with an area of 14,350 square feet. The proposed service station would replace buildings containing two dwelling units over ground floor stores and a paved area on the presently zoned C-2 portion of the lot and buildings containing six dwellings on the presently zoned R-4 portion of Lot 20.

Mr. Steele also advised the Commission that a letter had been received from William L. Becker, director of the Human Rights Commission of San Francisco, with comments on the subject application as well as application CU69.49. The letter read, in part, as follows:

> "We realize that fourteen units are a relatively small number, that some of them may not be in good shape, and that some may already be vacant. However, with the housing shortage as critical as it is, each chipping away of the supply, without action plans for replacement, is a move in the wrong direction. And the people now sheltered in these places are confronted with the almost insurmountable problem os (sic) finding decent housing they can afford. With the high priority need your Commission has pointed out of maintaining and increasing the housing supply, once again the question is cause versus people.
>
> The City Planning Code states that conditional uses 'will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity....'
>
> We request that your Commission considers (sic) these aspects of the two items above:
>
> 1. Relocation assistance by the Central Relocation Agency to the people living in the dwellings.
>
> 2. A plan for replacements comparable in size and rentals to the dwellings involved."

Mr. Steele stated that the buildings occupying the R-4 zoned portion of the subject site appear to be in good condition from the exterior; however, the apartment units located above the stores on the C-2 portion of the lot might be of lesser quality.

Gil Brannan, real estate representative for the Shell Oil Company, pointed out that all four corners of the subject intersection are zoned for commercial use. At the other three corners of the intersection, however, the commercial properties have greater frontage along Potrero Street than does the subject lot. Under the circumstances, approval of the subject application would "square off" the commercial frontages making them approximately equal at each of the four corners of the intersection. He stated that his corporation was aware of the residential implications of the proposed removal of existing housing units; however, because the subject site is located within two blocks of the new interchange at Army Street and because Potrero Street already carries a large volume of traffic, the property seems to be exceptionally well located for the type of commercial use proposed. If the subject application were approved, the service station existing on the commercially zoned portion of the subject lot would be updated and remodeled; and, during the remodeling process, the station would be moved further back from the property lines so that it would no longer be a sight barrier for pedestrians and automobile drivers. In addition, artificial lighting on the site would be improved. Plans for landscaping and for the other improvements would be worked out with the staff of the Department of City Planning if the application were approved. In conclusion, Mr. Brannan stated that his firm had exercised an option to buy the subject property contingent upon approval of the proposed reclassification.

No one else was present to speak in favor of the application.

Lewis Lindsay stated that he was opposed to any action being taken by the Commission which would further accommodate the automobile.

Mr. Steele remarked that the two stores and eight dwelling units, six of which are presently located on the R-4 portion of the lot, are in keeping with the neighborhood commercial and residential development in the general area. He stated that no need had been demonstrated for the proposed change in zone; and, in his opinion, the proposed use could well be detrimental to the neighborhood. Furthermore, the removal af apparently sound dwellings would further reduce the housing supply in the City. Under the circumstances, he recommended that the subject application be disapproved.

Mr. Brannan believed that the proposed service station would not contribute to traffic congestion in the area; and he felt that the public benefit would be served by drawing the station back from the property line so that it would no longer serve as a visual barrier threatening pedestrian and traffic safety.

Commissioner Kearney stated that he was opposed to the subject application because the proposed project would require the removal of existing residential units. Furthermore, he did not feel that service station use of the subject property would be as desirable as its continued use for housing units.

President Fleishhacker felt that it might be desirable if companies

such as the Shell Oil Company would become involved in projects to replace housing units which are removed to accommodate their commercial developments; he indicated, however, that he did not mean to suggest that such steps should be taken in the present case.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Kearney, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6423 be adopted and that the subject application be disapproved.

CU69.49 2351-2361 Post Street, south line, 200 feet west of Divisadero Street.
Request for an automobile parking lot in an R-3 district.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the N. Gray and Company Mortuary which is located on the southwest corner of Post and Divisadero Streets proposed to use subject property for an automobile parking lot. He stated that the mortuary presently has a parking lot abutting the mortuary building for fifteen cars with a principle driveway off Post Street and a secondary driveway onto Garden Street. The proposed parking lot, which would provide 26 additional parking spaces, would be separated from the remainder of the mortuary by an existing 22-unit, four-story dwelling. He stated that the subject property is presently occupied by a building containing six dwelling units; and he noted that a letter had been received from William L. Becker, director of the Human Rights Commission of San Francisco, expressing concern about removal of those dwelling units.

Mr. Smith, a member of the Board of Directors of the N. Gray and Company Mortuary, stated that his firm felt that the additional parking spaces would be necessary to supplement the fifteen parking spaces which are presently available to serve the mortuary. The building which would have to be removed was built around the turn of the century; and, because of its condition, he did not feel that the loss of the six dwelling units which it contains would be a matter of great moment.

President Fleishhacker, remarking that a large parking lot exists across the street from the subject site, asked if there is a deficiency of parking spaces in the subject neighborhood. Mr. Smith replied that the lot cited by President Fleishhacker is utilized by employees of the Mount Zion Hospital.

President Fleishhacker asked if it would be feasible to construct housing above the proposed parking lot. Mr. Smith replied that the subject lot is too small to accommodate a combined facility of that sort.

Commissioner Porter, remarking that members of the Commission had made a field trip to the subject property, stated that she questioned

the desirability of the subject block for residential units.

Commissioner Kearney asked how long it had been since the last tenant had left the building which occupies the subject lot. Mr. Smith replied that the last tenant had left six months ago.

President Fleishhacker noted that the City Planning Commission has no authority to require the replacement of dwelling units which are removed from the housing stock; responsiblity for such decision rests with the owners of private property and their developers. He asked that a reply be prepared to Mr. Becker of the Human Rights Commission, expressing sympathy with his concern, but informing him of the limitations on the powers of the City Planning Commission.

Mr. Steele recommended that the application be approved subject to four conditions which were contained in a draft resolution which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission. In making his recommendation, he advised the Commission that he had contacted the owner of the 22-unit apartment building which is located between the subject lot and the rest of the mortuary property; and that individual had indicated that he had no objection to the application.

Mr. Smith stated that he had no objection to the conditions which were contained in the draft resolution.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried 3 - 1 that Resolution No. 6424 be adopted and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution. Commissioners Fleishhacker, Newman, and Porter voted "Aye"; Commissioner Kearney voted "No".

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Administrative Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the special meeting held Friday, September 12, 1969.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Friday, September 12, 1969, at 2:15 p.m. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Mortimer Fleishhacker, President; James S. Kearney, Vice President; Walter S. Newman and Mrs. Charles B. Porter, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: William M. Brinton, James K. Carr and Thomas J. Mellon, members of the City Planning Commission.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Dean L. Macris, Assistant Director-Plans and Programs; Richard Hedman, Planner V, Urban Design; Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator; Phoebe H. Brown, Planner IV; James White, Planner III, Urban Design; Dennis Ryan, Planner II, Urban Design; Beatrice Ryan, Planner II; Thomas Spofford, Planner II; Theresa Kelso, Planner I; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Jerry Burns represented the San Francisco Chronicle; Elinor Hayes represented the Oakland Tribune; and William Dorais represented the Television Station KQED.

PRESENTATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS
ON DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA FOR ALCATRAZ ISLAND

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reviewed the events which had taken place since the City became aware that Alcatraz Island would be declared surplus by the General Services Administration in the early part of 1968. Most recently, the Board of Supervisors, sitting as the Surplus Property Commission, had allotted funds to the Department of City Planning to be used for the preparation of a report on design specifications for the Island; and the City Planning Commission had authorized the negotiation of a contract with Sedway-Cooke, City and Regional Planners, to assist the staff of the Department of City Planning in preparation of the report on development criteria and policies for Alcatraz Island.

Dean L. Macris, Assistant Director-Plans and Programs, summarized the policies which were being recommended as follows:

"1. The Island should be developed in a manner which contributes social, cultural, and economic benefits to the community and region.

2. Historic and continuity values of the Island should be protected by retention of remaining portions of Old Fort Alcatraz fortifications, later garrison facilities, and portions of the Federal Penitentiary.

3. Visually significant building, vegetation, and land forms as seen from on and off the Island should be preserved and enhanced.

4. The dramatic views from the Island should be protected and made accessible to the general public.

5. Public access to and throughout the Island should be provided at reasonable cost and on a convenient schedule.

6. The Island should be developed with uses and facilities sufficient to support year-round, day and nighttime, and all-weather use.

7. A broad combination of uses for the Island is appropriate. The primary function should be commercial-recreation. Housing, offices, institutional, cultural-educational, and commemorative uses may be ancillary to the primary use.

8. The public health, safety and convenience must be ensured by adequate provisions for needed services, facilities, and utilities, and the elimination of all hazardous conditions.

Based on the general policies which he had just mentioned, the staff had prepared a series of thirteen evaluative criteria which would be used by the staff in reviewing the proposed developments which had been submitted to the Surplus Property Commission. Mr. Macris felt that the most important of those criteria were the following:

"1. Consistency with View Protection Policies. The dramatic views from the Island and the visual

features of the Island seen from the mainland are to be preserved. Plate No. 4 and accompanying portions of the text described the criteria for access to and protection of views from the Island. Each scheme should establish a harmonious visual relationship with the Bay, the mainland, and the bridges.

2. Social Costs and Benefits. Each proposal should be examined to determine the types and extent of social costs and benefits which could accrue. For instance would the proposal fill an existing gap in social services, housing stock, cultural or educational facilities? How broad would be the exposure of the Island to various age groups, income levels, and ethnic groups?

3. Economic and Fiscal Costs and Benefits. The cost-revenue status of each scheme should be considered as part of the initial screening process. Though it would be infeasible to conduct an in-depth investigation of this aspect, each submittal should be considered on the following bases: 1) Would the development directly generate property and sales taxes in excess of public service costs? and 2) Would the development indirectly enhance local economic conditions?

4. Market Feasibility and Financial Capacity. In the initial review, each scheme should be analyzed to determine if it is financially reasonable. It must be shown that the type and level of development and the leases and/or sales, likely to be produced are consistent with the high demolition, repair, construction, service and maintenance costs of the Island. These must in turn be measured against the financial capacity of the lessee. In the case of public or noncommercial uses there must be evidence that adequate supporting funds could be secured. Additional consideration should be given to the type and scale of development and the relationship to existing and projected market conditions. An economic and market feasibility study should be required for second-round submittals."

The Director stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had determined that construction of a tower on Alcatraz are already suberb; and the construction of a tower on the Island, unless an exceptionally great height were to be obtained, would not improve the views which are now available. Neither would a tower be a desirable feature to look at from the mainland since it would detract from the prominence of the bridges and the natural land forms of the Bay.

Commissioner Porter asked if any detailed study had been made to determine the cost of providing utilities, transportation service, etc., for the Island. Mr. Macris replied that the burden of indicating economic feasibility would rest with the proposed developers and not with the City. He emphasized, however, that all economic arguments would be reviewed by the staff of the Department of City Planning.

The Director remarked that the staff of the Department of City Planning would be prepared to recommend that Alcatraz Island not be developed if the economic studies submitted by the proposed developers should indicate that significantly more development would be required to make the Island economically feasible than would be allowed under the design criteria which had been prepared.

Commissioner Porter commented on the fact that any development of Alcatraz Island would attract a great deal of traffic to the Northern Waterfront area; and she pointed out that the parking spaces which had been recommended in the Northern Waterfront Plan had been deemed sufficient to serve only the needs of that area and had not taken Alcatraz into account. The Director stated that a considerable number of people who would be going to Alcatraz would be in the Northern Waterfront Area already; however, he agreed that additional parking would have to be provided to serve traffic coming to the area specifically to visit Alcatraz Island. Therefore, it had been recommended that the developers of Alcatraz Island should provide a certain amount of money to the Parking Authority for construction of new parking spaces; and the staff of the Department of City Planning would work with the Parking Authority in choosing suitable locations for those facilities. Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator, described maps which had been prepared to illustrate the building preservation and construction limits which were being recommended, the features of the landscape of the Island which were being recommended for preservation, a map showing public access routes and views which should be retained, and a map showing the building envelope which was being recommended as seen from San Francisco. The maps which he described are available in the staff report which is available in the files of the Department of City Planning.

Commissioner Kearney asked if the staff was recommending that any portion of the cell block should be retained. Mr. Passmore replied that the staff was taking the position that the eastern portion of the cell block

could be retained if the developers so desired; however, it was recommended that the remainder of the cell block, containing kitchens, work shops, etc., be demolished.

The Director stated that the cell block building did not seem to be of great importance; however, the fortifications beneath the cell block building are of historical value and should be retained.

Commissioner Newman asked what action might be taken by the GSA if the City were to determine that development of Alcatraz Island would not be economically feasible and that the Island should be left as is. The Director replied that the City could acquire the Island for retention as open space; and, under those circumstances, the cost of the Island would be considerably less than it would be if a development were proposed.

Commissioner Newman asked if the City could control future use of the Island through zoning. The Director replied in the affirmative, noting that the Island is presently in the "P" or public zone. If the Island were sold or leased to private developers, however, the zoning of the Island would have to be changed.

President Fleishhacker asked if zoning would be enforceable if the Island were to be retained under the ownership of the Federal Government. Mr. Passmore replied that the Government has usually concurred in the City's desire to have zoning control over Government-owned land which is not in Government use.

The Director asked the members of the Commission if they agreed with the staff that Alcatraz Island should be developed. Commissioner Kearney replied in the negative. He felt that the prison structures and factories should be demolished and that only the lighthouse and the original fortifications should remain. The Island should then be landscaped and maintained in open use as a wildlife refuge and as a public park. He explained his reasoning as follows:

> "The existence of the Island is a key natural visual feature in the magnificant setting of San Francisco Bay. It can either enhance the beauty of the Bay or end up as a floating Coney Island and chamber of horrors on the front step of San Francisco, with barkers standing in front of the cell blocks hustling wide-eyed tourists to see for a price a shocking example of man's inhumanity to man -- an example where the animals caged in the City Zoo were treated better than the human inhabitants in the cages and dungeons of Alcatraz. In the public image, the historical assets of Alcatraz are not existent --

> it provides no more of an historical asset than Devil's Island. There are no historical assets, only depressing historical deficits which should be painfully and quickly erased."

In conclusion, Commissioner Kearney stated that it would be no credit to the City of San Francisco to have at its doorstep a showcase where the most dangerous criminals of the country had been kept.

President Fleishhacker felt that the only argument in favor of the development of Alcatraz Island was that such development would be profitable to the City; however, he pointed out that no one had yet determined if any development of the Island would be profitable. If no profitable development could be found, he agreed that the Island should remain undeveloped.

Commissioner Porter felt that it had been most unfortunate for San Francisco to have had a Federal prison at its doorsteps; however, she was not particularly upset about the possibility that the cell blocks might become a tourist attraction. If any development of the Island were to be seriously considered, however, she felt that intensive studies should be undertaken to provide assurances that the development would be economically feasible. Furthermore, while she agreed that it would be desirable to recommend that the contours of the Island be retained and that any development should conform to a specific building envelope, such standards would further circumscribe the possibility of achieving an economic development of the Island. Under the circumstances, she agreed with Commissioner Kearney in feeling that the Island should be preserved as public open space; and she believed that it should be feasible for the City to pursue that objective.

Mr. Macris stated that the Surplus Property Commission, in providing funds to the Department of City Planning for its study of Alcatraz, had intended that criteria should be developed which it could use in evaluating proposals which are being submitted for the development of Alcatraz Island. Thus, while the Commission might wish to recommend that the Island be retained as public open space, he felt that the Commission should also transmit its recommendation to the Surplus Property Commission regarding the development criteria which had ben developed by the staff of the Department of City Planning.

Commissioner Porter suggested that the Commission could make a recommendation that the Island be obtained for permanent open space and park purposes with a further statement to the effect that any developments which might be approved for the Island by the Surplus Property Commission over the recommendation of the City Planning Commission be in conformity

with the development criteria which had been developed by the staff of the Department of City Planning.

.President Fleishhacker stated that he would not be opposed to a nondetrimental development of the Island if it were to provide a source of revenue for the City.

Commissioner Newman stated that it was his personal feeling that the Island should not be developed. However, he believed that the Commission should not be "closed minded" about the situation; and, if development of the Island were to be permitted, he felt that conformance to the criteria which had been recommended by the staff would result in the "least harmful" development of the Island.

President Fleishhacker, acknowledging that the question of financial arrangements was not within the province of the City Planning Commission, stated that it was his opinion that the City should not be required to pay the Federal Government any money for Alcatraz since the property has no value. Commissioner Porter remarked that private individuals would probably be willing to pay money for the purchase of the Island if the City indicated that it was not willing to do so; and she felt that it would be better if the City would be willing to purchase the Island and to maintain control of the situation.

Commissioner Newman remarked that reviews of San Francisco and the North Bay from Alcatraz Island are the best that he had ever seen; and he felt that it was important that public access to the Island should be preserved.

Mr. Cooke stated that his firm had evaluated the desirability of using Alcatraz Island as a wildlife refuge, as a monument, for residential use, for office use, and as a historic park; and, for various reasons including public access, functional impact, economic feasibility, service requirements, and compatibility with local climatic conditions, it had been determined that none of those uses would be desirable nor practicable. Use of the Island for open park and recreation uses had also been considered. However, it was estimated that demolition of existing structures, repairs, and provision of even minimum power, water and waste facilities would be very costly; demolition and removal of most of the buildings and removal of the debris alone had been estimated variously at from $1.5 to $3 million dollars. Under the circumstances, his firm had concluded that a similar investment in funds could provide substantial open space in locations where it is more sorely needed. Nevertheless, his firm felt that use of the Island by the public would be desirable; and, since some development would have to be found which would justify the approximately $4 million expenditure which would be needed to prepare the Island for the public, they had recommended that an all-year, all-weather, family-oriented park with high quality amuse-

ment facilities and other complimentary features should be developed on the Island. Such use would ensure public access, could be compatible with preservation and design objectives, and would provide revenues necessary to service, improve, and maintain the Island. Unlike residential or office uses, the amusement facilities would not generate a demand for long-term parking spaces in the Northern Waterfront area.

Commissioner Porter recognized that the work of the consultants and been done in an extremely short period of time; and she felt that the recommendations contained in the report suffered from the "shotgun approach" which the consultants had been forced to take. If the Island were left alone for the time being, she felt that a good development might eventually materialize; however, if the City were to rush in under present pressures, she felt that it was very likely that a very bad development would result.

The Director remarked that any prospective developer of the Island would have to obtain the approval of many local agencies before being able to proceed with his project; and, during that interim, many of the problems foreseen by the Commission could be resolved. However, while the disposition of the Commission seemed to be to leave the Island alone, he felt that such an approach would not be realistic in terms of what will actually happen when the matter is decided upon by the Surplus Property Commission. Under the circumstances, he felt that it was extremely important that the development criteria which had been recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning should be endorsed by the Commission.

Commissioner Kearney disagreed with the Director. If the development criteria were to be endorsed by the Commission, the staff of the Department of City Planning would be expected to spend its time reviewing development proposals to determine which of the proposed projects would do the least damage to the environment; and he felt that such an expenditure of staff time would be a waste. In his opinion, the Commission should be firm and should adopt a policy that no development should be approved for the Island.

President Fleishhacker, noting that the consultants were recommending that indoor amusement facilities be developed on the Island, pointed out that a similar project had recently failed in Sacramento; and, under the circumstances, he believed that the Commission should have a great deal more information regarding the cost of the proposed development before giving its endorsement to such a use of the Island. He agreed with the Director that preservation of the Island for permanent open space will probably not be approved by the Surplus Property Commission; and, as a result, he believed that development criteria should be recommended by the City Planning Commission. However, in any event, he felt that a six to eight month study should be undertaken to determine whether any development of the Island could be both aesthetically pleasing and economically feasible.

The Director stated that he was convinced that any development constructed in accordance with the policies and criteria which were being recommended by the staff would be aesthetically pleasing; however, he conceded that it was not known for sure that such a development could be expected to bring economic benefits to the City. Under the circumstances, he felt that the Commission might wish to add a clause to the draft resolution which he had prepared which would recommend that an economic feasibility study be undertaken before a final decision is made regarding any particular development proposal for the Island.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6425 be adopted recommending that Alcatraz Island be purchased by the City for permanent open space.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Porter that the draft resolution recommended by the Director, with modifications, be adopted to serve as a guideline for review of any specific proposals for the development of the Island which might be considered should the Surplus Property Commission decide not to purchase Alcatraz for permanent open space. One of the modifications of the draft resolution which she proposed was the addition of a resolve which would specify that a six-month feasibility study should be made before any development is approved to determine whether such a development would be in the economic interests of the City of San Francisco.

The Director asked if the resolution being submitted by Commissioner Porter would include the last resolve of his draft resolution which read as follows:

> "And be it further resolved, that the Planning Commission endorses in principle the preservation of existing Island buildings and plant and land forms as shown on Plates No. 2 and 3 of the report, the development of public access and views as shown on Plate No. 4 of the report, and the proposed new building areas and limits as shown on Plates Nos. 2 and 5."

Commissioner Porter replied in the affirmative. Since the motion which she had made received no second, Commissioner Porter withdrew the motion. Subsequently,she moved that the matter be taken under advisement for one week at which time all members of the Commission were expected to be present. That motion was seconded by Commissioner Kearney and carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Administrative Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, September 18, 1969.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, September 18, 1969, at 1:00 p.m. at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Mortimer Fleishhacker, President; James S. Kearney, Vice President; William M. Brinton, Thomas J. Mellon, Walter S. Newman, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, and Walter W. Wight, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation; Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator; Ralph Mead, Planner IV (Zoning); Edward Michael, Planner III; Calvin Malone, Planner III; Thomas Spofford, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Scott Blakey represented the San Francisco Chronicle; and Elinor Hayes represented the Oakland Tribune. Television Channels 4 and 5 were also represented.

1:00 P.M. - Field Trip

Members of the Commission and staff departed from 100 Larkin Street at 1:00 p.m. to take a field trip to properties scheduled for consideration during the zoning hearing on October 2, 1969.

2:15 P.M. - 100 Larkin Street

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of September 11, 1969, be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported that he had met with a group of citizens in Chinatown on Tuesday evening to discuss the present status of the Master Plan proposed for that area and to advise them that two sites were being considered for new public housing complexes in the area. Both of the housing complexes would be combined uses, one having ground floor commercial uses and the other having a public parking garage.

[illegible]

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

[illegible] of the regular meeting held Thursday, September [illegible], 1969.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, September 18, 1969, at 1:00 p.m. at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Jacques Fleishhacker, President; James S. Kearney, Vice President; William M. Brinton, Thomas J. Mellon, Mary Rose Naylor, Mrs. Charles E. Porter, and Walter S. Tilden, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None.

The staff of the department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation; Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator; Ralph Mead, Planner IV (Zoning); Marshall Kaplan, Planner III; Thomas Debartolo, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Dorian Gaffney represented the San Francisco Examiner; Scott Blakey represented the San Francisco Chronicle; and Esther Hyde reported for the Oakland Tribune. Television-Channels 4, and 5 were also represented.

1:00 P.M. - Field Trip

Members of the Commission and staff departed from 100 Larkin Street at 1:00 p.m. to take a field trip to the places scheduled for consideration during the zoning hearing on October 2, 1969.

2:15 P.M. - 100 Larkin Street

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Kearney, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of September 11, 1969, be approved as submitted.

GENERAL MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported that he had met with a group of citizens in Chinatown on Tuesday evening to discuss the present status of the Harbor Plan proposed for that area and to advise them that the sites were being considered for new public housing developments in the area. Many of the housing complexes could be condition uses, the housing around Ilora Commercial Area and the other having a public parking garage.

The Director distributed a draft resolution which he had prepared by which the Commission would adopt the amended Urban Beautification Program for San Francisco for the Fiscal Years 1969-70 thru 1973-74. The draft resolution would also request the staff of the Department of City Planning and the Board of Supervisors to take whatever steps are necessary to secure a Federal grant in support of the Urban Beautification Program. After summarizing the amounts of money which were proposed to be allocated to various areas of the City during the next fiscal year the Urban Beautification Program, the Director recommended adoption of the draft resolution.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Brinton, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6426.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Mellon arrived in the meeting room and assumed his seat at the Commission table.

President Fleishhacker asked the Director to comment on the action which the Board of Supervisors had taken on Monday in opposition to the bus transit system which had been proposed to bring commuters from Marin County to San Francisco. The Director stated that it was his opinion that both bus and ferryboat systems should be encouraged since studies which had already been prepared indicated that the two systems would not be incompatible. However, while bus transit service could be provided almost immediately, it would take at least two or three years to place a ferryboat system in operation; and, for that reason, he felt that work on both systems should be initiated immediately. In conclusion, he stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning would prepare a report and recommendations for Commission action on the Marin transit issue which he would present to the Commission at an early date.

FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA FOR ALCATRAZ ISLAND. (Under Advisement from meeting of September 11, 1969).

The Director noted that the Commission had adopted a resolution on September 12, 1969, expressing its policy that Alcatraz Island should be purchased by the City for permanent open space. The position of the Commission was clear; however, he felt that it should be recognized that effectuation of the Commission's recommendation would not be easy to achieve. If the Surplus Property Commission were to join the Commission in feeling that the most desirable use of Alcatraz Island would be as permanent open space, they might choose the private proposal submitted to them which would involve the least amount of construction on the Island but which would serve to bring ownership of the Island to the City at the earliest possible date; and, if that action were to be taken by the Surplus Property Commission, that Commission might also establish stipulations to the effect that the Island should be turned over to the City as open space at the end of a certain number of years. In the meantime, the staff of the Department of City Planning would have to review the proposals which had been submitted to the Surplus Property Commission both in terms of the City Planning Commission's position that the Island should be retained as permanent open space and in the light of the design criteria which had been developed with consultant assistance.

Commissioner Mellon advised the other members of the Commission that the policy stated in the resolution adopted on September 12 was not inconsistent with one of the proposals which was currently being considered by the Surplus Property Commission.

At 2:55 p.m. President Fleishhacker announced that the meeting was recessed. Members of the Commission then proceeded to Room 282, City Hall, where they were joined by Commissioners Kearney and Wight, and reconvened at 3:00 p.m. for hearing of the remainder of the agenda.

ZM69.21 Public hearing on proposed rezoning of property within the area bounded generally by the eastern boundary of Fort Mason, Van Ness Avenue, Bay Street, Mason Street, Francisco Street, the east slope of Telegraph Hill, Broadway, The Embarcadero, the Bay Bridge, and the Pierhead Line.

President Fleishhacker welcomed the members of the audience to the public hearing which would constitute the initial step by the City to implement the Northern Waterfront Plan.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to maps on the wall of the meeting room to describe both the existing and the proposed zoning within the subject area and the existing and proposed special height limit districts within the area. Mr. Steele also summarized the zoning provisions which would apply in the three special use districts which were being proposed, noting that Port operations and industrial commercial uses in direct support thereof would be permitted in each of the special use districts even though the underlying zone might not otherwise allow such uses. In Special Use District No. 1 all new development not in direct support of Port operations would require conditional use approval by the City Planning Commission. In Special Use Districts Nos. 2 and 3, certain uses, particularly open uses or those which would be traffic generators, would require conditional use approval by the City Planning Commission. In conclusion, Mr. Steele stated that the staff's initial recommendations for height limitations for the area between the Embarcadero and the Pierhead Line from Broadway to the Bay Bridge were being re-evaluated and would be the subject of another public hearing to be held by the Commission at a later date.

Commissioner Mellon remarked that the block bounded by North Point, Beach, Powell, and Stockton Streets, which is owned by the Public Utilities Commission, was being recommended for R-4 zoning rather than C-2 zoning; and the Director of Property had prepared a report indicating that the value of the property would be substantially less under R-4 zoning, perhaps to the extent of $50 or $30 per square foot. Under the circumstances, he was concerned about the reasoning of the staff of the Department of City Planning in recommending that the property be zoned R-4 rather than C-2.

Mr. Steele stated that the property owned by the Public Utilities Commission lies in a residential corridor which leads from Telegraph Hill to the Bay; and the staff had felt that it would be desirable to encourage further residential development in that corridor. He indicated, however, that ground floor commercial uses with a hotel above would not be an undesirable use for the block.

Commissioner Mellon asked if hotel use of the site would be permitted under R-4 zoning. Mr. Steele replied that hotel use of the site could be permitted as a conditional use.

The Director stated that a hotel use would be a conditional use on the lot regardless of the zoning because of the special use district which was being proposed; however, ground floor commercial use of the property would be permitted even if the property were zoned R-4 because the block lies adjacent to a C-2 zone. He stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning was anxious to provide additional housing within the study area which would be located as near to the water as possible; and, because other housing exists in the immediate vicinity of the property owned by the Public Utilities Commission, that block was deemed to be desirable for housing. He stated that the zoning which was being proposed was based upon the proposals which had been contained in the Northern Waterfront Plan which had been incorporated as a part of the Master Plan; and he noted that the Northern Waterfront Plan had been the subject of review and discussion for a long period of time. In spite of those circumstances, however, he had learned of the objection of the Public Utilities Commission only during the past week.

Commissioner Mellon stated that neither the Public Utilities Commission nor the Director of Property had been aware of the zoning which was being proposed for the site. The Director of Property felt that the R-4 zoning being proposed would not permit the highest and best use of the property; thus, the proposed zoning would downgrade the value of the property. The matter had been discussed with Mayor Alioto; and he had concurred with the opinion of the Director of Property. Commissioner Mellon remarked that several proposed developments had been considered for the property owned by the Public Utilities Commission, including an International Fish Market development; and he was surprised that the Department of City Planning had not been aware of those discussions.

The Director stated that he had been aware of the International Fish Market proposal; and he indicated that he had discussed use of the property for housing directly with Mr. Carr, the General Manager of the Public Utilities Commission. He agreed that the highest and best use of the property should be sought; and, while others might not share his point of view, he felt that the R-4 zoning which was being recommended would achieve that objective. If the City Planning Commission could not recommend zoning for City-owned property which would help to achieve the adopted plan for the Northern Waterfront area, then he felt that the plan might as well be forgotten since the Commission could not ask private property owners to accept zoning changes which the City itself would regard as unacceptable.

Commissioner Mellon assured the Director that he understood the point which he was trying to make. Nevertheless, given rising tax rates, etc., he felt that the City should take every opportunity to avail itself of additional revenues; and he regarded the property owned by the Public Utilities Commission as a potential source of additional revenue for the City. Under the circumstances, he felt that the Commission should give some consideration to the taxpayers and that it should do everything possible to avoid downgrading the value of the property owned by the Public Utilities Commission. In conclusion, he stated that inclusion of the block owned by the Public Utilities Commission in the C-2 district would not mean that the City Planning Commission could not achieve a plan which would be compatible with the best interests of all concerned.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Mellon, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that no action be taken regarding the property owned by the Public Utilities Commission during the course of the present hearing.

Diamantes D. Katsikaris, representing The American Taxpayers Union of California Incorporated Unit Three, read a prepared statement in which he indicated that he had visited the Department of City Planning in August, 1967, to obtain a copy of the Commission's resolution including the Northern Waterfront Plan as part of the City's Master Plan; and that resolution was not available. He felt that the proposed amendments would serve only the interests of big developers and that they would inevitably lead to the destruction of the waterfront view which belongs to the people of San Francisco.

The Director advised Mr. Katsikaris that the Master Plan had not been amended to include the Northern Waterfront Plan until June, 1969; and for that reason, the information which Mr. Katsikaris wanted would not have been available in August, 1967.

Robert E. McCoy, representing Hertzka and Knowles, Architects, noted that the proposed zoning standards would limit the size of mechanical penthouses to fifteen percent of the gross area of the roof of any new building; and, referring to a rendering which he had prepared of a typical 84-foot building, he advised the Commission that at least thirty percent of the gross area of the roof of such a building would be required for a mechanical penthouse. Under the circumstances, he hoped that the Commission would take this problem into account before taking action on the proposed special height limit districts.

President Fleishhacker pointed out that one solution to the problem described by Mr. McCoy would be to construct a lower building.

Thomas L. Scholten, 133 McCoppin Street, stated that it was his opinion that City officials frequently "knuckle under" to large developers; and he resented such circumstances. He felt that construction of high-rise buildings within the Northern Waterfront area would cause "view polution"; and he regarded it as the

duty of the City Planning Commission to protect the citizens of San Francisco against construction of buildings such as the 500- or 800-foot high building which was being proposed for the area south of the Ferry Building. He also felt that large buildings should be light colored instead of dark colored such as the Bank of America Building.

Mrs. Marjorie Brush, 12 Reno Place, asked if it were true that the special height limit districts being considered by the Commission would allow no building over 84-feet high to be constructed along the edge of the water. The Director replied that the Commission was presently considering special height limit districts of 45 feet, 65 feet, and 84 feet for the area north of Broadway. Height limits for the area between Broadway and the Bay Bridge would be the subject of another public hearing to be held by the Commission at a later date. The staff of the Department of City Planning had originally made recommendations for specific height limits for the area between Broadway and the Bay Bridge; however, since very strong opinions had been registered both for higher and lower limits than had been recommended, the staff had decided to give further attention to that area.

Mrs. Brush stated that she felt that the height limits which were being recommended were "horrible".

Gunnar Anderson, 400 Pacific Avenue, represented the Western Reneline Corporation, owners of more than one-half of the block bounded by Montgomery, Chestnut, Francisco, and Kearney Streets. While the staff of the Department of City Planning had recommended that the height limit for that property be reduced from 84 feet to 65 feet, he pointed out that directly north of his corporation's property an adjacent 95-foot building is currently being remodeled and will remain in the area. With the aid of an illustration, he also pointed out a 72-foot building in the block directly south and stated that the proposed height limit on Reneline's property would not allow them the height enforced by their neighbors. Furthermore, since an 84-foot building constructed on the property owned by his corporation would not affect views from Telegraph Hill, he felt that the 84-foot height limit should be retained.

Edward Lawson, representing the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, stated that the comments which he wished to make pertained to the area south of Broadway which was not presently under consideration by the Commission.

Michael Marston, representing the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association, felt that the combined zoning, height limit, and special use districts which were being recommended represented an effective means of controlling development in a special and unique section of the city; and he strongly supported adoption of the proposed standards as the first step towards implementation of the Northern Waterfront Plan. He stated that he recognized that there would be strong economic pressures for development within the Northern Waterfront area, particularly in the area around the Ferry Building; and he felt that the most effective way to control such developments would be to set an example with public land, particularly land which is owned by the City. In that regard, he objected strongly to the Commission's decision to exclude the property owned by the Public Utilities Commission

from consideration during the present hearing. He noted that the technical advisory committee for the Northern Waterfront Study had been made up of representatives of the Real Estate Department, the Public Utilities Commission, and many other City departments; and, as a result, he felt that no City department should have been surprised by the recommendations which were contained in the plan. Therefore, he felt that no exception should be made by the Commission in taking action on the zoning, height limits and special use provisions presently under consideration.

D. G. Baldwin, representing the Northwestern Pacific Railroad Company and the Holiday Wharf Company, stated that the firms which he represented had made a multi-million commitment to construct a new hotel on a portion of the block bounded by Beach, North Point, Jones, and Leavenworth Streets. The property is presently zoned C-2 which allows construction of a motel as a principle permitted use. Under the zoning standards being recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning, however, a motel would be classed as a "conditional use"; and, as a result, any alterations to the proposed motel would have to have the specific approval of the City Planning Commission. He indicated that he was firmly opposed to the proposed change of zoning.

President Fleishhacker stated that the motel could be reconstructed without the approval of the Commission if it were destroyed by fire. However, as a conditional use, specific approval would have to be obtained from the Commission for any additions to the building.

Mrs. Orena, 1945 Jefferson Street, stated that she did not understand how an International Fish Market could constitute the "highest and best use" of the property owned by the Public Utilities Commission. She also stated that she could not visualize how an 84-foot high building would look. President Fleishhacker replied that the Ice House is approximately 84-feet high.

Anna Morelli, 333 Greenwich Street, indicated that she was of the opinion that all of the area should be subject to 40 or 65-foot height limits. The 84-foot height limit which had been recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning seemed to her to be too high; and she believed that buildings of that height would destroy views for people living lower on the Hill.

Mrs. G. Jean Kortum, representing the Protect Our Waterfront Committee, stated that the variable height limitations of 40 feet, 65 feet, and 84 feet, seemed to satisfy most of the members of her organization; however, some of them were concerned about the language of the proposed ordinance which would allow the City Planning Commission to grant exceptions to those height limits through conditional use procedures for parcels of property as large as three acres or more. She stated that the only property consisting of more than three acres of which she was aware is owned by the Travelers Insurance Company; and she did not feel that a corporation of that size needs any special favors from the City of San Francisco. Under the circumstances, she urged that the language pertaining to parcels of more than three acres be deleted from the proposed ordinance. In conclusion, Mrs. Kortum stated that she was also concerned about the provisions of the proposed ordinance which

would allow certain additional rooftop features up to 1,600 square feet in area to rise to a height of 126 feet. That language had also been included in the existing ordinance; and she felt that it must have been designed to accommodate water towers or other structures of that sort.

The Director conceded that the ordinance language pertaining to rooftop features of less than 1,600 square feet was, in many respects, obsolete. However, while the language could be removed from the proposed ordinance, its removal would not place any height restrictions in these features; and, therefore, the ordinance would be more restrictive if the language were retained.

Mr. Steele stated that elevators and stairway housings would be allowed to exceed the established height limits by only ten feet or sixteen feet, depending on the basic height allowed in the district. Flag poles or ventilator shafts, however, might obtain the permitted height of 126 feet in certain instances.

Mrs. Kortum stated that members of her organization were also very concerned about the fact that height limits for the area between Broadway and the Bay Bridge were being made the subject of further review by the staff of the Department of City Planning; and they hoped that the staff would not recommend higher limits as a result of its new review.

Marvin D. Morgenstein, attorney for the owners of property in Block 142 and 143 which are located north of Broadway in the vicinity of Sansome Street, stated that he objected to the proposed reduction of the height limit on his client's property from 84 feet to 65 feet. He stated that an 84-foot building constructed on the property would not interfere with any views; and, therefore, there seemed to be no reason for the proposed reduction of the height limit. He stated that he was particularly concerned about the proposal since reduction of the height limit from 84 feet to 65 feet would decrease the value of his client's property by approximately 25 percent.

Adolph S. Rosekrans, architect, pointed out that the 84-foot height limit would be retained for other properties in the immediate vicinity of the property owned by Mr. Morgenstein's client; and, under the circumstances, he did not understand why continuation of the 84-foot height limit had not been recommended for the entire vicinity. He stated that he had analyzed the affects which an 84-foot building on the site would have on views; and he displayed sectional drawings of both the Broadway and Vallejo Street frontages of the property illustrated that an 84-foot building on the site would not interfere with the view line as taken from a point on one of the piers. Since the property in question lies in a pocket, he felt that the height limit should not be reduced from 84 feet.

Donald Fisher, owner of the property to which Mr. Morgenstein and Mr. Rosekrans had referred, stated that he had been advised by the Assessor's Office that lowering of the height limits from 84 feet to 65 feet would result in a 24 percent reduction in the assessed value of his property. As a result, he would

suffer an economic loss of approximately $600,000. Furthermore, if a 65-foot building were to be constructed on the site instead of an 84-foot building, the City would lose approximately $76,500 annually in tax revenues.

The Director stated that the sectional drawings which had been presented by Mr. Rosekrans were reasonable; however, he pointed out that very few people would actually view the property in question from a point on one of the piers as Mr. Rosekrans had done. He stated that he had given personal consideration to the property in question; and, having made a field trip to the area, he had come to the conclusion that there would be a vast difference between a 65-foot building and an 84-foot building on the site, particularly as viewed from Vallejo Street.

Mr. Morgenstein emphasized that the property owned by his client sits in a pocket, there being a 35-foot difference in elevation along Broadway between Sansome and Montgomery Streets. Under the circumstances, he believed that it would be possible to draw a sight-line from any part of the City to prove that an 84-foot building on the property owned by his clients would not affect any views. Furthermore, in view of the fact that the property will be surrounded by 84-foot buildings, he felt that the 65-foot limit proposed by the staff of the Department of City Planning should not be approved by the Commission.

Gerald P. Cauthen, representing the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, felt that it was crucial that the future growth of San Francisco should be planned in a logical and consistent manner; and, for that reason he believed that zoning and other controls should apply not only to small property owners but to big developers as well. After reading articles which had recently appeared in the newspapers, he had reason to doubt that all developers would be treated the same, particularly since the Port Commission had already announced that a large project would be constructed on Port property south of the Ferry Building by a private developer. He felt that the Port Commission should strive to maintain and improve the authentic maritime industries along the Northern Waterfront; and he felt that the members of that Commission should be detered from becoming real estate agents rather than Port Commissioners.

President Fleishhacker asked Mr. Cauthen to direct his comments to specific proposals which were presently under consideration by the Commission.

Mr. Cauthen stated that he represented 580 people who have a real stake in the Northern Waterfront area; and he indicated that they were generally concerned about certain trends which might weaken the Northern Waterfront Plan if they were to be continued.

Commissioner Mellon advised Mr. Cauthen that the City Planning Commission represents the interest of the citizens of San Francisco as a whole, not just the 580 people represented by Mr. Cauthen.

Commissioner Brinton felt that Mr. Cauthen was questioning whether economic developments should be allowed to supersede preservation of certain assets which now exist.

Mr. Cauthen stated that he felt that it would be deplorable to remove shipping activities from the Northern Waterfront area and to replace them with a wall of high-rise buildings. In taking over the Port Authority from the State of California, he believed that the citizens of San Francisco had wanted to prevent the State from violating local zoning policies; and, under the circumstances, he felt the City itself should not violate its own principles for the Northern Waterfront area.

Commissioner Porter, remarking that the Telegraph Hill Dwellers had participated on the Northern Waterfront Citizens Advisory Committee for a period of two and one-half years, asked if the organization approved of a variable height limits of 40 feet, 65 feet and 84 feet which were being recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning. Mr. Cauthen replied in the affirmative; however, members of his organization did not approve of the language of the proposed ordinance which would permit the Commissiom to allow new developments on sites in excess of three acres to exceed the established height limits.

Mrs. James Wiley, representing San Francisco Beautiful, stated that she concurred with the remarks made by Mr. Marston of the San Francisco Planning and Renewal Association.

Mrs. Kenneth Evers, 255 Chestnut Street, noted that all of the property located between the water's edge and the pierhead line is controlled by the Port Commission; and she felt that the Port Commission should start behaving like a local agency instead of like a State agency. Even if property between the water's edge and the pierhead line were governed by a 40-foot height limit, the distance between the points would be so great that an optical illusion would be created which would effectively block out the view of the water from Telegraph Hill. Under the circumstances, she felt that the area between the water's edge and the pierhead line should be given further consideration by the staff of the Department of City Planning.

Robert Katz, 2 Whiting Place, stated that he and other members of the Telegraph Hill Dwellers were happy to see that a number of good features had been incorporated in the plan for the Northern Waterfront area and that the zoning standards specifically under consideration would affect Port-owned property as well as private property; however, they were concerned about the recent City Attorney's opinion which indicated that Port properties might be exempt from zoning regulations under circumstances. He stated that people were generally satisfied that new Waterfront development would not be allowed to exceed the coverage of the existing piers; and he was pleased that developers with property in excess of three acres would have to seek conditional use approval from the Commission for their projects. He was glad that the 40-foot height limit had been retained; and, in spite of the objection voiced by Commissioner Mellon, he felt that the staff's

recommendation for a residential corridor from Telegraph Hill to the Waterfront, including the property owned by the Public Utilities Commission, was a desirable objective.

Mr. Katz suggested, however, that one change should be made in the language of the proposed ordinance. As recommended by the staff, the ordinance would allow buildings located in a 40-foot height limit district to have a floor area ratio of 5 - 1. Since the two standards were basically incompatible, he felt that the 5 - 1 floor area ratio allowance might be used to defeat the 40-foot height limit at some future date. Under the circumstances, he felt that new developments in the 40-foot height limit district should be limited to a floor area ratio of 4 - 1. Also, while he did not mind flag poles, he felt that mechanical penthouses and towers should not be allowed to reach a height of 126 feet; and, therefore, he urged that the obsolete language which had been remarked upon by the Director be removed from the proposed ordinance. In conclusion, he stated that he objected to the fact that the waterfront properties from Broadway to the Bay Bridge had been removed from the Commission's agenda; and he also felt that the proposed ordinance should have contained some standards for governing the construction of billboards in the Northern Waterfront area.

Bruce Moody, 2666 Hyde Street, objected to the fact that the division line between the C-2 and R-3 district had been drawn down the center line of North Point Street between Leavenworth and Polk Streets instead of being drawn along rear property lines; and he hoped that the line could be changed to include the south side of North Point Street in the C-2 district instead of in the R-3 district as recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning.

Dr. Frank Hinman, Jr., representing the Russian Hill Improvement Association, reiterated the support of his organization for strict height controls. He also joined with Mr. Katz in expressing concern over the possibility that the 5 - 1 floor area ratio which had been recommended for certain properties under the 40-foot height limit might be used to exploit the height limit.

Another individual in the audience urged that the south side of North Point Street be included in the C-2 district which had been recommended for the north side of the street. It seemed to him that both sides of the street should enjoy equal zoning.

Commissioner Porter stated that the drawing of zoning lines down the center lines of streets had always been somewhat disturbing to her. She did not feel that it was desirable to have businesses on one side of a street and residences on the other side.

After further discussion, the Director recommended that the Commission take the entire matter under advisement until a specific future date so that the members of the Commission would have an opportunity to take a field trip to the properties which had been discussed during the course of the present hearing.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Mellon, and carried unanimously that the matter be taken under advisement until the meeting of October 16, 1969.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Administrative Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, September 25, 1969.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, September 25, 1969, at 2:15 p.m. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Mortimer Fleishhacker, President; James S. Kearney, Vice President; Walter S. Newman, and Mrs. Charles B. Porter, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: CCommissioners William M. Brinton, James K. Carr, and Thomas J. Mellon.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation; Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Scott Blakey represented the San Francisco Chronicle; and Elinor Hayes represented the Oakland Tribune.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Kearney, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of September 4, 1969, be approved with corrections.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, advised the Commission that the Streets and Transportation Committee of the Board of Supervisors was holding a public hearing on the subject of street trees for Market Street; and he indicated that he would have to attend that hearing following his report to the Commission.

The Director informed the Commission that the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors, meeting on Wednesday, had approved the submission of an application for a Federal grant in support of the Urban Beautification Program for the 1969-70 fiscal year.

The Director reported that the Urban Design Citizen's Advisory Committee had met on Wednesday and had received a report from one of the consultants participating in the study. He indicated that the Commission will receive a report on the Urban Design Study during its meeting of October 9.

The Director advised the Commission that a report on the status of the Ferryboat Proposal and the optimum bus proposed for transit service between San Francisco and Marin County would be presented during the Commission's meeting on October 2.

The Director reported that the Department of City Planning's baseball team had beat the Redevelopment Agency by a score of 21 to 20 on Tuesday evening.

R69.45 Tower at Lands End in Lincoln Park for overhead power line to Mile Rock Light Station.

The Director advised the Commission that the Coast Guard had withdrawn their request for the Tower and the overhead power line.

At this point in the proceedings, the Director absented himself from the meeting room for the remainder of the meeting.

CURRENT MATTERS (Continued)

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, stated that he had received a request for modification of the Geneva Terrace Planned Unit Development which had been approved by the City Planning Commission in 1961. Instead of constructing the four-bedroom homes which had been shown on the original plans, the new developer proposed to construct fifty new three-bedroom homes with fireplaces, family rooms, and other added amenities. The original architect had also drawn the plans for the new buildings; and the plans had been cleared with the architectural committee of the neighborhood organization. He recommended that the plans be approved by the Commission.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the plans be approved as submitted.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Administrative Secretary